## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 236 JC 680 466

By- Gott, Richard H.
Junior College into Four-Year College: Rationale and Result in Two Institutions.
California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
Pub Date 68
Contract- OEC-6-10-106
Note- 85p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.35
Descriptors- *Colleges, *Higher Education, *Institutions, *Junior Colleges

This report of two case studies examines the causes and effects of a junior colleg[illegible]hange into a 4-year institution. The hypothesis supported by the findings was that the goals of a 2-year community college will not be adequately served in a 4-year college even where there is a formal commitment by the 4-year college to serve such goals. Variables measured were: (1) background and rationale for upward extension, (2) formal intent of the enabling legislation, (3) goals and philosophy of the college, (4) attitudes of administrators, (5) attitudes of faculty, (6) curriculum, (7) attitudes of trustees, (8) costs to students, (9) admission policy, and (10) probation and retention policies. Among the conclusions: (1) demand was manifested for a 4-year institution to serve students within commuting distance of the 2-year colleges; (2) before the change, the colleges were unable to institutionalize themselves as 2-year colleges within the community; (3) once a movement for upward extension begins, it automatically increases unless conditions are altered; (4) when statewide planning fails to provide 4-year college facilities in a given area of proven need, the 2-year college will encounter irreconcilable problems in institutionalizing itself; (5) a 2-year college staff generally has a vested interest in promoting upward extension of its college, and (6) expanding existing 2-year college facilities seems more economical than constructing new 4-year facilities. (RM)

# Junior College Into Four-Year College
# Rationale and Result in Two Institutions

RICHARD H. GOTT

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education is engaged in research designed to assist [illegible] responsible for American higher education to [illegible] quality, and availability of [illegible]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# JUNIOR COLLEGE INTO FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE:

## *Rationale and Result in Two Institutions*

By
Richard H. Gott

ED 025236

1968

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 4 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

# *Contents*

PREFACE by Leland L. Medsker

I INTRODUCTION: THE ISSUES I

II PURPOSE AND DESIGN 14

III UPWARD EXTENSION IN TWO JUNIOR COLLEGES 22

IV SOME CONCLUSIONS 62

Appendices

References

# *Preface*

American higher education is never static and particularly in the last decade it has been in a continual state of transition and change. As an increasing number of people of all ages have sought admission to college, as students have raised questions about the nature of their collegiate experiences, and as colleges themselves have been caught up in uncertainties concerning their role and function in society, numerous institutions of higher education have made plans, for varying reasons and to achieve different goals, to change their structure or mission, or both. At the same time, new types of institutions have been created and existing ones expanded.

These new developments have taken a variety of forms: For instance, many colleges and universities, especially the more prestigious ones, have become increasingly selective in their admission policies; community colleges have increased dramatically in number and enrollment; in some states, institutions offering only upper division and graduate courses have been established to serve transfers from the state's system of junior colleges; and most state colleges that once offered only a baccalaureate degree now include courses at the master's degree level.

Presumably, one way to increase the scope of a system of four-year colleges would be to convert certain two-year colleges into four-year institutions. While there are some instances of this, the incidence of such practice to date has been considerably more limited than the speculations about its likelihood. Such speculation, incidentally, has caused some lay and professional people to fear that if many junior colleges expand into four-year colleges, the nation will be confronted with the problem of a good many weak four-year institutions. Although so far such fears seem to be largely unfounded, certain questions must be considered at a time when most states are highly involved in planning for higher education.

Some of the major questions that raise themselves for consideration are related to the forces which operate to lead junior or community colleges to become four-year institutions, and others cohere around the issue of the impact of expansion on the character of the original two-year unit. Most authorities fear that an extended two-year college is one likely to abandon many of its traditional and unique junior college functions.

Because the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley has long been interested in viable patterns of higher education, it assisted Dr. Gott in the study here reported. His inquiry into the dynamics of change in two colleges which had undergone the transformation from two-year to four-year status sheds light on several of the issues involved and on the effects of vertical extension. While for maximum results such a study should be continuous over a period of time, Dr. Gott's study, as of a given point in the lives of the two institutions, adds needed information about this significant problem and suggests directions for further research on a larger scale. Meanwhile, the implications of some of the findings of this report will be of interest both to the community of higher education and to those large segments of the lay public that share its concern for the developing shape of higher education in the United States.

LELAND L. MEDSKER, *Director*
*Center for Research and Development*
*in Higher Education*

*Berkeley, California*

## *Acknowledgments*

This study was financially supported by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, to which I am most grateful.

Dr. Leland Medsker deserves a special note of thanks for the expertise, support, and guidance which he generously provided throughout the duration of the study.

The trustees, administrators, and faculties of the colleges studied gave unstintingly of their time and were most cooperative in every way. The presidents of the two colleges were especially helpful and concerned, and to them must go a word of sincere appreciation. While they occasionally disagreed with me about interpretation of developments and data, they were eminently objective and fair vis-à-vis all aspects of the study.

Mrs. Harriet Renaud assumed the not inconsiderable task of editing this study and her organizational ability and professional competence are evident throughout. I am especially grateful for her tact, patience, and consideration.

–R.H.G.

# I

# Introduction: The Issues

Vertical extension, or expansion, of academic programs in institutions of higher education, is a continuing phenomenon in the United States. The increased need and demand for post high school education since World War II has generally precipitated either one of two responses in existing institutions of higher education: they have become increasingly selective or they have expanded. Some exceptional institutions have done both. Expansion generally is accomplished by making more student positions available in existing programs (horizontal expansion) or by adding advanced programs (vertical extension).

Of the 319 institutions of higher education that added advanced programs from 1953 through 1964, the 178 four-year colleges which began offering the master's degree constituted the largest proportion of schools that changed (Schultz and Stickler, 1965). Slightly over half of these colleges were under some form of private control, 143 were coeducational, and almost half had total enrollments of under 1,000. The major reason for vertical growth in these institutions seemed to be the changing requirements of teacher education; most states now require either a master's degree or some form of graduate study for secondary certification and many require graduate work for elementary certification. Recent legislation in California, for example, has made it mandatory for elementary teachers to have an academic bachelor's degree plus an additional year of professional course work in education, including supervised teaching experience. Expansion also took place in response to the need for graduate programs to accommodate relatively new fields such as counseling, developmental reading, and other new educational techniques. Sixty-nine colleges initiated doctoral degree programs during this period, but were unsuccessful in many instances because of inadequate financing and staffing. Forty of these were public, 60 were coeducational, and 56 had enrollments of over 1,000.

The junior college also has proved susceptible to the phenomenon of vertical extension. While it has generally responded to the increased demand for higher education by making more student positions available, there have been some significant exceptions. Schultz and Stickler (1965) recorded that from 1953 through 1964 some 72 two-year colleges became four-year institutions–61 of these under private and/or denominational control, the other 11 under public control. Of the 72 junior colleges that made this transition, 42 had enrollments of under 500 and 61 had enrollments of under 1,000. The authors suggest that these small enrollment figures give rise to serious questions about the need, purpose, and even viability of vertical extension of academic programs in two-year colleges.

The pressure of mounting enrollments cannot be shown to account for the academic extension in these two-year institutions, since the majority were small colleges whose enrollment did not substantially increase after the extension. The major motivational force behind the change seemed to be the desire to emulate the traditional, more highly institutionalized four-year liberal arts college. Riesman (1956) has noted that "isomorphism" tends to characterize change at all levels of higher education:

> The upgrading of . . . institutions toward the model of the liberal arts colleges and universities has been a persistent tendency in American higher education and is still going on [p. 247].

McConnell (1962) also has noted the tendency of American colleges and universities to imitate more prestigious models, but he theorized that for the junior colleges it was the prospect of "soaring enrollments" that probably lay behind their desire to become four-year institutions.

It has often been noted that the junior college has been too susceptible to the influences of the four-year college and university. Medsker (1960), for example, has spoken of the difficulties junior colleges have encountered in attempting to develop certain interdisciplinary courses which are not granted transfer credit at many four-year colleges, but which nevertheless are appropriate to the general education needs of the junior college student:

> The result is that some two-year colleges identify themselves so closely with a four-year institution that they organize and teach most courses in exactly the same manner as in the particular four-year college. When this happens, the junior college forfeits its identity and its opportunity to experiment in the development of a program most appropriate for it [p. 53].

Even junior colleges seemingly committed to comprehensive functions at the two-year level often emphasize programs that parallel those of the four-year college and university. Furthermore, many of the major internal issues being dealt with in the junior college today revolve around tendencies to move the junior college even closer to the four-year model–through selectivity of students, the use of academic rank, and the introduction of tuition. There can be little doubt that the four-year college concept seems to offer the lure of greater status and prestige, not only to administration and faculty, but also to the surrounding community.

As a relative latecomer to American education, the junior college often seems still to be undergoing its novitiate, although its acceptance as a full partner in higher education has been increasingly marked since World War II. In many ways it faces the same problems of role, identity, and image that the early land-grant colleges faced, beginning in the last century and continuing even into recent times. McConnell (1962) has noted:

> The recognition attained by land-grant colleges is said to be a refutation of the generalization that most institutions attempt to gain status by developing imitatively rather than distinctively. But separate land-grant colleges gained broad public acceptance painfully. For a long time they were called "cow colleges." They have managed to escape this appellation by becoming more like the state universities . . . [p. 65].

Medsker (1960) also has discussed the problem of establishing a unique identity within the hierarchy of higher education, with particular reference to the junior college:

> Though it would seem that the attention paid the junior college in recent years would indicate that it has fully achieved an identity of its own, many debatable issues still exist. For example, is public education through the fourteenth grade the birth-right of every American child? Is the public junior college an extended secondary school, or is it part of higher education?
>
> Should junior colleges be fully state-supported, fully locally supported, or jointly supported? Should they be autonomous units responsible to either extension centers or branches of a parent college or university? Are local junior colleges best controlled through unified districts or through separate junior college districts?
>
> States vary among themselves not only in the interpretation of the nature of the two-year college, but also of its role in higher education. In fact, not even all of the staff members of the junior colleges are in agreement on the purposes, practices, and best organizational pattern of the two-year college [p. 27].

The diverse functions the junior college performs, which range from offering lower division college parallel courses to supplying remedial education, may also hinder the development of a unique identity. The problems of character and role were described by Clark (1960) in this way:

> How can an educational organization be both a public school and a college? The major hiatus in the organization and outlook of American education has been between the secondary school and the college. In straddling this divide, the public junior college meets contradictions that are not readily resolved [p. 168].

One of the contradictions to which Clark referred may be illustrated by reference to *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California* (1960), which stated that the junior colleges were part of public *higher* education. In another section of this influential document, however, junior colleges were declared to be part of the public school system and hence subject to the State Education Code as promulgated by the State Board of Education. Thus, while the junior college was officially categorized with higher education, it was at the same time identified with the subcollegiate public school system. It is true that this left the junior college eligible to receive certain state and federal funds generally reserved for secondary schools, but the endurance and viability of any large-scale social organization is dependent upon its achievement of a clear and separate identity. There is a need first to establish a clear-cut role and then to institutionalize this role. Clark (1960) described organizational role as:

> ... the performance of an organization that is associated with a place within a larger system. Roles are affected by the place assigned to an organization among other organizations and by the particular capacities that it develops through time. Roles may be designed or may emerge in unplanned ways [p. 157].

While the term "to institutionalize" is subject to interpretation, the meaning intended here is the one presented by Selznick: ". . . 'to institutionalize' is to *infuse with value* beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand." Selznick further argued that the tasks of infusing the organization with social value and preserving its institutional character or integrity are the responsibility of administrative leadership.

The viability of the junior college is no less dependent upon its ability to create an identity through role adaptation and institutionalization than other large-scale social organizations, yet in many areas this goal has not been achieved. In some states, however, notably Michigan and California, where this separate identity has been encouraged and established to varying degrees, there has been little or no change from two-year to four-year operation. In California, for example, a four-year public college may be established only after the area which it will serve has provided adequate junior college facilities for its student-age population (Semans and Holy, 1957). These junior colleges then serve as feeder schools for the four-year college. The curricula of new four-year colleges generally do not overlap with those of the surrounding junior colleges except in lower division transfer work.

Thus, through legislative sanctions, the state of California serves to establish, protect, and even enhance the institutional integrity of the junior college. Other states do not, however, legitimatize or institutionalize the two-year college when they permit or encourage them to expand into four-year institutions instead of establishing new four-year colleges when the need for them arises. When the establishment of a four-year college is regarded as obviating the need for the functions performed by the two-year college, it might be postulated that no overall plan of development for higher education is being adhered to, or that coordinating controls are inadequate or lacking, or that the functions of the junior college are imperfectly understood.

Until recently, locally controlled public junior colleges generally showed little tendency to extend upward, and the majority of schools that changed in this way were those under private and church control. According to Eells and Martorana (1956), between 1945 and 1956 only three locally controlled junior colleges became four-year colleges, while some 88 private and/or church-controlled junior colleges engaged in upward extension. However, as noted earlier, of the 72 junior colleges that made the transition between 1953 and 1964, eleven were publicly controlled. While there is a three-year overlap in the time periods covered by these two studies, it seems nonetheless pertinent that during the earlier period, the public junior colleges accounted for only 3 percent of the total number which extended, while slightly later they accounted for approximately 15 percent.

As enrollments continue to rise and as the financing of public higher education becomes an increasingly acute problem, the tendency toward upward extension of academic programs in junior colleges seems destined to take on new significance.

## Review of the Literature and Related Research

While upward extension of academic programs has been a major characteristic of American higher education, at least since the introduction of the German university concept, there is a singular dearth of published material about this transition. Schultz and Stickler (1965) have noted:

> Since this process of vertical extension is a phenomenon of major proportion in American higher education, one would expect that it had been systematically studied and analyzed, or at least widely discussed in the professional literature. Such, however, is not the case. Literature on the topic is limited and fragmentary.
>
> Most writing on the subject relates to junior colleges becoming senior colleges [p. 231].

"Most" in this instance does not indicate a substantial number, however, since material available on upward extension at other levels of higher education is all but nonexistent.

During the years immediately following World War II, there was a strong drive in California to transform junior colleges into four-year colleges, primarily in order to make it possible for returning veterans to complete baccalaureate programs without incurring the expense of living away from home. In response to considerable pressure, the state asked Professor Emeritus George Strayer of Columbia University to make recommendations on the issue of expansion. In the year preceding the Strayer Report, no fewer than six bills were introduced in the California Legislature which would have permitted the move from two-year to four-year operation. One bill would have made it ostensibly possible for any two-year college to make this transition upon request. Writing about this period, Winter (1964) noted that:

> The arguments advanced were that there would be great savings if students could live at home and part of the buildings needed were already supplied by the established junior college. Local control could be expanded to the four-year colleges, as well as in the junior colleges.
>
> The Strayer Report stemmed the movement by pointing out the tremendous expense of 55 state-supported, four-year colleges and that after the four-year colleges were established the next step would be for a graduate school in each. Furthermore, many instructors in the junior colleges were not prepared for upper division work, and a large extension of library facilities and laboratories would be needed. Finally, it would destroy the junior college with its unique role of supplying transfer, terminal, remedial, and general education to all people at a low cost [p. 19].

To date, the Strayer Report has been successful in heading off the movement from two-year to four-year operation in California, which has the largest junior college system in the nation. The general effect of the Strayer Report, however, has not prevented this issue from periodically arising in California in various guises. It was raised most recently in a Senate Bill (No. 1062) introduced in the California State Legislature in 1965. Although the bill failed to come out of committee, its proposals are still occasionally discussed:

> Authorizes governing board of junior college district which maintains one or more junior colleges to establish one four-year community college within the district to provide instruction including thirteenth and fourteenth grades presently taught in the junior colleges leading to a bachelor's degree.
>
> Authorizes governing board to fix admission fee and rate of tuition for pupils attending community college in grades other than grades thirteen and fourteen.

Writing in 1953, Horn claimed to foresee the eventual end of the junior college. He argued that its growth was neither being sustained at the rate it had enjoyed from 1920 to 1940, nor keeping pace with other segments of higher education. But its final decline, he predicted, would come about as a result of its increasing tendency to stretch to four years.

Horn used Connecticut as an example of a state in which the trend toward converting the junior college was marked. He pointed out that although the state had eight junior colleges in 1952, one year later three were four-year colleges, one had merged with a four-year college, one was granting a bachelor's degree in at least one curriculum, and the other three were not true junior colleges. Horn noted that the Strayer Report had checked the move for extension in California, but he felt that increasing pressures would diffuse its effect:

> The development which has occurred in Connecticut—and elsewhere, and which had been put off in California by mandate—seems not only inevitable but desirable. In communities large enough to warrant a four-year senior college, and where sound educational standards can be assured—a condition which should prevent many junior colleges from aspiring too hastily to senior-college status—the development of junior colleges to such status would be welcomed and encouraged [p. 433].

The major reasons advanced for upward extension were the need for additional education in an increasingly complex society and the need to provide continuing education for adults.

Horn's statement about the converted four-year colleges—"the great need in terms of their development is for institutions that are truly community colleges" —would indicate that he was hoping for, if not actually advocating, some form of four-year community college that might combine the multiple functions of the junior college with those of the baccalaureate-granting college. He asserted further that the social, economic, and professional pressures inherent in American society will interact to upgrade the general educational level of society, with the result that junior colleges will inevitably evolve into four-year institutions. Additional pressure, he noted, would come from within the junior college itself:

> One should also mention a pressure of another kind operating to transform junior colleges into senior colleges. That is the pressure from junior college faculties to acquire a more assured status, to achieve greater academic respectability. Too many junior college faculty members have some feeling of inferiority in comparison with their colleagues in the senior colleges [p. 434].

In 1957, Eells and Martorana published a study concerned primarily with the frequency of upward extension in junior colleges and with certain other factors related to the change, such as geographic location, type of control, and size. Their study was designed to shed light on the role, function, and stability of the junior college as a viable educational institution. They noted the problem the junior college has faced in establishing a unique function within higher education and, in effect, in institutionalizing itself:

> From time to time . . . educational leaders and others have said that the junior college is a very unstable institution, that it is transitional in character, and that it is eager to transform itself into a 4-year college granting the baccalaureate degree [p. 110].

The results of their study indicated, however, that the junior college, particularly where it is publicly controlled, is a stable educational institution. Of a total of 699 junior colleges, 91 (13 percent) extended during the period from 1945 to 1956. But of the group that made the change, only 18 were publicly controlled institutions (enrolling about 90 percent of all junior college students at the time). Of these 18, only three institutions in Texas, or less than one percent of the total number of junior colleges, were locally controlled. Eells and Martorana found this low figure significant, and commented:

> It is the local junior college, frequently referred to as the community college, that is the largest and fastest growing of the public junior colleges. In the judgment of many educators who have given thought to the matter, the community junior college, closely responsive to

> local needs and conditions, controlled by locally elected boards of education and frequently supported at least in part by local funds, is considered as the typical and most significant institution at this level—the junior college of the future. . . . The local junior or community college is thus shown to be a *highly stable* institutional type. By contrast, more than a quarter of the state junior colleges have become 4-year institutions [p. 111].

It could be inferred from this study that local control aids the junior college in affirming its distinctive functions, while state and private control tend to make it more responsive to influences that move it in the direction of the four-year college.

The largest number of all types of junior colleges that become four-year colleges was found in the eastern and southeastern states. They tended to be denominationally controlled and not accredited by national or regional associations; well over 50 percent had fewer than 300 enrolled. To the question posed in the title of their study, "Do Junior Colleges Become Four-Year Colleges?" the authors' answer was emphatically, "No":

> . . . the results of this study suggest that there is little factual basis for the frequently expressed fear that establishing 2-year community junior colleges will lead ultimately to a rash of 4-year colleges, granting the baccalaureate degree [p. 115].

In a follow-up study to the one discussed above, Eells and Martorana (1957) sought to assess how the change upward tended to affect curriculum. Focusing particularly on terminal, semiprofessional, and vocational/technical curricula, they attempted to determine to what extent academically expanded colleges remained responsive to the broad spectrum of community educational needs.

Of the 72 expanded colleges for which information was available, three-fourths, including 16 of 17 publicly controlled colleges, reduced their terminal offerings. The state-controlled public colleges reduced their terminal curricula from 56 to 18, while the locally controlled public colleges reduced from 32 to 3, a decrease of over 90 percent. Not even the private or denominationally controlled junior colleges had such a dramatic decrease in terminal offerings. In addition, not one of the three locally controlled junior colleges continued to offer one-year terminal curricula. Specifically, 12 technical programs and 10 commercial programs were affected, and several programs in home economics, medical technology, and agriculture were eliminated in the three publicly controlled local colleges. The state-controlled public colleges followed the same pattern, but eliminated fewer terminal offerings. Thus, of all types of junior colleges that had become four-year colleges, the public colleges under local control decreased their terminal curricula the most.

This Eells and Martorana study was based only on the catalog listings of the colleges involved, and did not necessarily reflect programs actually offered or the size of enrollments in specific curricula either before or after change. The authors concluded that the changeover probably was attended by a decreased concern for programs which met the needs of terminal students, but commented on the limits of their study:

> This study was based on sources of data which could not be reliably used to find reasons for the decrease in number and scope of terminal offerings when 2-year colleges change to 4-year status. Studies seeking the answers as to why this is the case are needed and a number are being planned both within and without the Office of Education [p. 153].

Schultz and Stickler's 1965 survey of upward extension at all levels of higher education analyzed the numbers and types of institutions that underwent such change, identified characteristics of the transition, and laid groundwork for further research. According to their figures, 72 junior colleges became four-year colleges between 1953 and 1964. Of these 72, eleven were publicly controlled, 23 independently controlled, and 38 under denominational control. Over half had enrollments of over 500, but no breakdown by type of control was given. Noting the meagerness of existing research on which to build, the authors pointed out the need for further investigation of upward extension.

The authors concluded that: There was no relation between size of enrollment and decision to undertake vertical extension; most administrators had little understanding of the process of vertical extension; there was generally no detailed planning use made of consultants; not enough time was allowed between the decision to change and the initiation of the transition; in the years immediately following transition, upper division students came primarily from within the institution; attracting adequately trained faculty was a major problem; library and other facilities had to be substantially expanded; and vertical extension required a greatly expanded budget.

The findings of this 1965 study confirmed those of Eells and Martorana's earlier investigation (1957) of the effect of expansion on curriculum:

> When vertical extension in academic programs occurs, the previously existing programs of the institution are likely to receive relatively less attention and support than was the case before the transition took place [p. 241].

Reflecting the growing concern with upward extension of academic programs in junior colleges, three recent doctoral dissertations have dealt with this issue as it pertained to private and/or church-controlled colleges. Merrill (1961) studied a private university that had evolved from a private two-year college and attempted to establish the criteria necessary for a successful transition. Smith (1961) concluded as a result of his study of one school that upward extension came about as a result of the institution's attempt to more adequately meet the educational needs of its student body. Roueche (1964) presented what may be termed the classical problems in his analysis of the transition from two-year to four-year operation in a private church-controlled college. He found that inadequate financing, inadequately prepared faculty, and higher tuition rates were some of the factors which combined to make a relatively weak senior college out of a first-rate junior college.

Morrison (1966) has summarized available information on upward extension in the junior college and cautioned that transition to a four-year college was not necessarily to be equated with "progress." He proposed eight questions that any junior college contemplating upward extension should carefully consider:

1. Will this change alter the main objectives of this college?
2. Are the additional services already available in the area?
3. Can the additional funds needed be provided without eliminating many deserving lower-division students?
4. Is enrollment in the first two years sufficiently large to suggest an efficient, economically effective upper division?
5. How many faculty members are at present adequately prepared to teach upper division classes and assist in research?
6. How long has this transition been studied? Has the study resulted in a developmental plan?
7. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this plan in terms of student services and curriculum development?
8. Has preliminary discussion been held with the state coordinating agencies and regional accreditation agencies [p. 443]?

Morrison noted that the criteria for changing private junior colleges are probably different and revolve around issues of adequate potential enrollment, faculty, facilities, and finances. For the public junior college, he called attention to the report of the 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education and the 1957 report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

Both reports, he pointed out, stressed the unique function and contribution of the junior college in meeting the diverse educational needs of the community-at-large and rejected the idea that they existed only to relieve the enrollment pressures of senior institutions. He added:

> These [junior colleges] respond to the increasing demand for a greater variety of more accessible training and education, while at the same time helping other colleges and the universities to concentrate a greater proportion of their energies than would otherwise be possible on the upper division, graduate and professional work. . . . Community colleges are not designed, however, merely to relieve enrollment pressures on senior institutions. They have a role and an integrity of their own [p. 444].

Morrison was the only writer among those considered here who stressed that the state coordinating agency should have a role in deciding whether or not junior colleges should become four-year colleges. He argued also that the establishment of the need for a four-year college should not be construed to mean that the need for a comprehensive junior college has been superceded, and that new four-year colleges should be planned and constructed so as to be separate from existing junior colleges.

## Implications of Upward Extension

Upward extension of academic programs in the junior college poses serious questions about the college's viability as a separate and distinctive educational institution within the hierarchy of higher education. If the junior college is seen primarily as a transitional institution in process of becoming a four-year college, then society does not sufficiently value the functions it serves–functions which are not served at the same level by any other segment of the educational structure.

The dramatic decrease in one-year and two-year occupational programs in colleges that have undergone vertical extension is portentous. While other segments of higher education within a given geographical or state area offer four-year programs, it is generally true that the community college is the only segment of higher education that offers one-year and two-year curricula which include vocational/technical and general education programs. Thus, the only available form of higher education is effectively denied a sizeable portion of the population, usually the lower socioeconomic strata, when junior colleges become four-year colleges. Serious implications for individual social mobility and social stratification arise from such a situation.

In addition, what effect does extending a college have on local business and industry, especially when drastic reduction of vocational/technical preparation result? Is other provision made for offering the remedial programs which have become an increasingly important function of the community college? As society grows more aware of the educational and occupational handicaps of lower socioeconomic and/or minority groups, the possible phasing out of a community college poses many questions about who will take over the broad functions this institution performs in response to community educational needs.

These factors lead to what must be deemed a central issue: How does a changeover affect the make-up of the student body? If terminal and other programs are drastically curtailed, and if, for all practical purposes, only an academic program leading to the baccalaureate degree is offered, then it would also seem necessary to select students with the demonstrated ability and potential to succeed in such a program. If four-year programs are to predominate, then it is necessary to have students who are both academically capable and motivated to take advantage of them. But large numbers of junior college students do not fall into this category. Medsker (1960) has pointed out that research on junior college students leads to the conclusion that the great need in junior college education is not for more curricula that prepare for transfer, but for curricula which provide more adequate terminal and general education programs for the two-thirds of the junior college students who do not transfer.

The junior college has long laid claim to being a democratizing agent in higher education, providing for the development of a great range of talents within one social institution. The theory behind this claim is, of course, that the individual talents and aspirations of all people are worthy of maximum development and support from the general community. Would the metamorphosed publicly supported four-year college continue to embrace and effectuate this philosophy? The move from two-year to four-year status may have serious consequences for the functioning, stability, and endurance of the junior college. It also raises significant questions for the community which it serves.

# II

# *Purpose and Design*

The purpose of this study was to examine, through a general use of the case study method, the rationale and implications of upward extension in two four-year colleges which had recently evolved from local or state-controlled two-year community colleges.

It has been noted that the propensity for isomorphism that tends to characterize American higher education contributes to the difficulty that the junior college encounters in establishing a unique identity. It has also been noted that there are educational, historical, sociological, psychological, and economic forces which interact to retard or subvert the development of an individual identity in certain two-year institutions by encouraging them to attempt to approximate the four-year liberal arts college. This study sought, therefore, to identify such forces more specifically, to focus on the ways in which they interrelate to bring about change, and to determine the consequences of upward extension for the comprehensive functions of the junior college.

In its broader aspects, this study is concerned with the general problem of goal change in complex organizations. The colleges are conceived of as examples of complex organizations which have undergone adaptive change to new goals by expanding from two-year to four-year colleges.

Continuing study of organizational goals is integral to the development of organizational theory. From a theoretical viewpoint, this study was concerned with the effect of new goals on older goals in a complex organization. The central question is whether it is possible for an organization to serve concomitantly and equitably both the older goals and those which have been superimposed.

Sociological studies have dealt with the supplanting of goals in complex organizations as the original organizational goals have been met. Sills (1957), for example, in a study of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, indicated that after the original goal was met, i.e., discovery of a vaccine against polio, the organization was enabled to pursue new but similar goals through the commitment of its members.

Failure to meet the goals for which an organization is conceived may also lead to goal change, as Messinger (1955) reported in his study of the Townsend Organization. Since many of this organization's original goals had been met through the years by government agencies, informal goals had tended to supplant the initial formal goals:

> We can broadly describe this adaptation by asserting that the dominating orientation of leaders and members shifts *from the implementation of the values the organization is taken to represent* (by leaders, members and public alike), *to maintaining the organizational structure as such,* even at the loss of the organization's central mission [p. 10].

In a study of the Young Men's Christian Association, Pence (1939) indicated that this organization's goals had undergone change, not because they were met, but because the social environment in which they were conceived had altered:

> In contrast with the conception of earlier years, when the principal concern of the Association was with the securing of individual commitments to the Christian life, the realization has steadily grown in recent years that religious living and interest are so gravely conditioned by the total social experience that the two cannot be dealt with separately [p. 315].

Several studies have also indicated that in complex organizations older goals and objectives are lost sight of in the preoccupation with administrative routine. Michels' (1949) study of unions and social-democratic parties in Germany and Selznick's (1949) study of the Tennessee Valley Authority suggest that means not only greatly influence ends but sometimes become ends in themselves.

## The Two Colleges Studied

In the two colleges studied for this report, the need to serve the older or original goals was clear, as was the ostensible commitment to meet these goals. Both organizations also, however, accrued new goals and became committed to serving both old and new goals within the same organization and with the same leadership and personnel. Meeting the original goals meant continuing to offer four-year college transfer courses, general education programs, one-year and two-year terminal programs (including those of an occupational nature), educational programs for adults, concert and lecture programs for the community, short vocational courses to meet local employment needs, and remedial courses for marginal students. Serving the goals of a four-year college meant adding curricula leading to the baccalaureate degree in liberal arts, education, business, and technology below the engineering level.

It was the clear intent of the colleges to continue serving both sets of goals equitably and concomitantly—not by merely allocating precisely 50 percent of the facilities, resources, or attention of administrators to each, but by not supporting one set of goals at the expense of the other. Both organizations planned physical expansion to accommodate the new goals, with no diminution of facilities or resources devoted to serving the old goals.

Since this study was primarily concerned with whether the older goals of a complex organization, i.e., the two-year college goals, would continue to be adequately served when newer goals were added, a hypothesis, supported by previous studies, was developed to focus on this issue. The several hypotheses considered were that:

> The formal intent of the organization may be met, and both old and new goals served.
>
> The old goals may be so firmly institutionalized that the new goals are unable to gain acceptance within the organization.
>
> The old goals may be completely displaced by the new goals.

Earlier studies have indicated that when two-year colleges engage in upward extension of academic programs, the functions and goals normally ascribed to this type of college tend either to atrophy or to be sloughed off by the college itself. The following hypothesis was therefore formulated:

**The goals of a two-year community college will not be adequately served in a four-year college even when there is a formal commitment on the part of the four-year college to serve such goals.**

In order to test this hypothesis, the following variables were selected for study:

*Background and Rationale for Upward Extension.* The persistence of original goals can be assumed to be related to the extent to which the pressures for extension included awareness of the need for the functions performed by the two-year college.

*Formal Intent of Enabling Legislation.* The wording and intent of the legislation which sanctions change from a two-year to a four-year college contain important clues about whether the goals of a two-year college will continue to be met after expansion. For instance, a college "authorized" to continue two-year functions and a college specifically "charged" to do so probably tend to perform these functions to different degrees.

*Goals and Philosophy of the College.* The college's own interpretation of the change of goals and philosophy tend to indicate the degree to which the original goals of the college will continue to be met.

*Attitudes of Administrators.* The attitudes of the president and the administrative staff play a major role in the fate of two-year college functions. An administration favorably disposed toward such functions, for example, is more likely to support their continuation.

*Attitudes of the Faculty.* In the final analysis, the implementation of the goals of the college lies in the hands of the faculty. If faculty members are opposed to performing the functions which serve the goals of a two-year college, the functions atrophy and the goals are not served.

*Attitudes of the Trustees.* The attitudes of the trustees toward the goals and purposes of the college also help determine whether the two-year college goals will continue to be served. A new board established to serve the four-year college, with little knowledge about the community college, can be expected to give little support to two-year college functions.

*Curriculum.* Assessment of changes in the curriculum indicate the extent to which the changes further or detract from the goals of the two-year college. If two-year vocational programs are reduced, for example, it can be assumed that the college has reduced its commitment to its original goals.

*Costs to Students.* Since free or low tuition and fees tend to characterize the public two-year college, substantial raises in costs to students tend to militate against the serving of two-year college goals.

*Admission Policy.* Since a relatively open admission policy characterizes the public two-year college, any move toward increased student selectivity decreases the possibility of serving community college goals.

*Probation and Retention Policies.* Moves to shorten the probationary period or eliminate marginal students more quickly clearly indicate departure from the goals of the two-year public college.

## The Case Study Method

Since such variables as intra-institutional attitudes and background and rationale for change in an organization do not lend themselves to purely quantitative analysis, the general techniques of a case study were used for this investigation.

A case study focuses on internal analysis, and in this instance the analysis is of a complex social organization. The structure and function of an organization are influenced by the behavior and attitudes of individuals and sub-units both inside and outside the organization. Study of the effect of these factors before, during, and after change, combine to make up what might be termed "institutional analysis." Selznick (1949) posited the situation in the following manner:

> The study of institutions is in some ways comparable to the clinical study of personality. It required a genetic and developmental approach, an emphasis on historical origins and growth stages. There is a need to see the enterprise as a whole and to see how it is transformed as new ways of dealing with a changing environment evolve [p. 141].

Clark (1960) had made the point that although complex organizations are in a continual state of flux, "What can be studied at any one time are the ways in which an organization is formed and transformed by internal and external pressures."

Lipset, Trow, and Coleman (1962) considered the advantages and disadvantages of internal analysis as opposed to comparative analysis and concluded that:

> . . . internal analysis has no great disadvantages with respect to comparative analysis. It may, in fact, have one important advantage: by taking simple comparative correlation out of the reach of the investigator, it focuses his attention upon the underlying processes which operate within the system. In this way the internal analysis may lead to a deeper explanation of the phenomenon and to generalization of a more fundamental kind [p. 479].

A case study of this type, which would identify relevant forces, issues, and sources of information, and develop a matrix for further information, should precede any comprehensive comparative study of a large sample of institutions.

The alternative to depth analyses of individual institutions would be to collect information on a relatively few selected characteristics from a larger number of institutions, i.e., a sampling drawn from all institutions in this category. Such comprehensive sampling is done essentially by means of a questionnaire. The present investigation, however, being a case study, used a number of techniques to collect data–principally interviewing, record collecting, observation, and a limited use of questionnaires.

## Selection of Colleges

Two factors were considered essential in selecting the two participating colleges: the evolvement from a junior college had to have taken place at least three years earlier so that certain aspects of change would have had time to become apparent, and the colleges had to be willing to cooperate closely with the research project.

The college selected for the in-depth case study will be referred to as the "target college." In history and development it is in several ways typical of American institutions of higher education. Founded as a secondary academy by a religious group in 1889, it added a two-year normal school in 1916 and by 1923 had discontinued its high school offerings and emerged as a two-year institute. In 1933, having become a member of the American Association of Junior Colleges and having been accredited by the regional accrediting association, it was transferred by gift to the state in which it was located. It then became a state-supported junior college under the overall direction of the state board of education, with its own locally elected governing board.

World War II brought considerable population and economic growth to the area served by the target college, and returning veterans gave new impetus to the college. With state aid the college acquired a new site away from its urban center and began an ambitious building program. The ferment to move to a four-year operation, which had begun well before 1949, boiled over into the state legislature in that year, and a bill approving a four-year educational program in arts and sciences, business, and education passed both houses but was vetoed by the governor.

The enrollment and building program proceeded apace during the next ten years, however, and in 1959 another bill to enable expansion was introduced, this time with success. Legislation was enacted and signed into law to allow the college to move gradually into a four-year operation, beginning with a junior class in 1962.

The second college, studied less extensively, was chosen to afford a comparison with the target college and will be referred to as the "comparison college."

Founded by a group of interested citizens as a private two-year college in 1933, an act of the state legislature four years later enabled the local community to form a junior college district and assume operation of the school. In 1961, under an act of the state legislature, the operation of the comparison college was vested in the trustees of the state colleges. Their recommendation, that the college expand into a four-year institution, was accepted and enacted into law. Thus, the comparison college not only has a shorter life history than the target college, but a shorter history as a four-year college as well.

## Design of the Study

Each of the colleges was visited over a period of a year for a total of approximately three weeks, and visits also were made to state and local agencies which exercised control or influence over the schools.

Interviews were conducted with board members, administrators, faculty members, students, community leaders, and state agency personnel, and access was obtained to a great number of pertinent documents. Both the colleges and the state and local agencies made available minutes of board meetings, student personnel records, college catalogs, local newspaper files, college committee records, state legislative proceedings, Chamber of Commerce files, accreditation reports, and records from various state agencies.

Two questionnaires also were used, one prepared for faculty and one for trustees. A three-page questionnaire (see Appendix A), distributed to all faculty members of the target college, was designed to elicit information about biographical data not otherwise available, and about attitudes toward the "open door" admission concept, the various functions generally performed by a two-year community college, and the change from two-year to four-year operation.

The questionnaire was also used to assess differences in attitudes and responses between faculty who had taught in the college when it was a two-year operation and those who had been employed after the move to four-year operation was sanctioned. To this end, members were divided into two categories labeled "old" and "new"–the former consisting of those who had been employed prior to 1960, the latter comprising those employed in 1960 or after.

Since the legislation creating a four-year college was passed in 1959, the assumption was that faculty employed in 1960 or later had been employed with the understanding that they would be teaching in a four-year college within two years. Interviews with college administrators indicated that as soon as legislation authorizing the move to four-year operation was passed, attempts were made to draw from a wide geographical area instructors who either had Ph.D.'s or were doctoral candidates close to their degrees. It seemed clear, therefore, that there would be differences in professional experience, educational background, and origin between old and new faculty and that these differences would be reflected in their responses to the questionnaire. Approximately half of the college's 240 faculty members responded to the questionnaire.

The other questionnaire, sent to the trustees of both colleges, was based on the one distributed to the target college faculty (see Appendix B). It sought essentially to gain information by which to gauge the attitudes of the trustees toward the "open door" concept and the functions generally performed by a two-year community college. In addition, it sought information about whether there were 1) pressures to eliminate some functions and 2) projections for the addition of graduate work. Fifteen of the 21 trustees involved responded.

## Definition

The terms "two-year college," "community college," and "junior college" are used synonymously throughout this study. Two-year colleges may take many forms, ranging from university extension centers offering only transfer curricula to purely technical institutes, but it is most widely characterized in the following way: a locally controlled, publicly financed, two-year college whose curricula generally consist of lower division college or university parallel courses, general education courses, terminal programs of an occupational nature including vocational/technical curricula, adult and/or evening course offerings, community service projects such as concert and lecture series, programs through which students may remove educational deficiencies, and a counseling and guidance program adequate to meet the needs of the student body.

This is, to be sure, an ambitious undertaking for any educational institution in any culture. In this regard, Medsker's (1960) comment is especially appropriate:

> No unit of American higher education is expected to serve such a diversity of purposes, to provide such a variety of educational instruments, or to distribute students among so many types of educational programs as the junior college [p. 7].

# III

# *Upward Extension in Two Junior Colleges*

## Background: The Target College

In the 15-year period between the end of World War II and 1959, when the target college was finally authorized to expand, numerous attempts were made to change its nature, character, and function. Undoubtedly this impulse was encouraged by the influx of returning veterans determined to take advantage of the educational opportunities offered under the G. I. Bill of Rights, but a statement published in 1953 attests to the college's long-time interest in converting to a four-year institution:

> *For eight years* we have worked for this small expansion of [our] charter. During this time, we estimate from our plans that approximately 3,200 bright, clear-eyed American youth have been thwarted in their career plans through lack of money to go away to school. The individual loss in technical, cultural, civic, moral and military training is not nearly as great as the loss to the community, the state and the nation.
>
> The responsibility rests upon the state. The problem cannot be solved by refusing to face it or by shifting it to the next legislature. It will only become more acute and more aggravated.

The college's own drive toward change was evidently supported, after World War II, by community attitudes; bills were repeatedly introduced in the state legislature to modify the character of the college—either by turning it over to locally supported districts, returning it to denominational control, or expanding it to four years. None was successful, and feeling seems to have run so high over the governor's 1949 veto of the bill to approve four-year curricula in several fields, that his subsequent defeat at the polls is still frequently attributed to his position on this issue. At the time, the governor had held that the state could not afford a third state college, and in addition to considerable political maneuvering, there seems to have been pressure for the veto from the state college communities, faculty, and alumni.

There can be little doubt that the target college community, including faculty and administration, felt themselves at an economic disadvantage in not having a local four-year college. Since the area in which the college was located was second in the state in size and rate of growth, the refusal to recognize the need for a four-year college there was widely considered a great disservice to the community. Both the college and the community published numerous brochures to point out how much revenue was lost when local students were forced to leave town to finish their college education.

The college community itself was undoubtedly the prime mover in promoting the academic extension, and the current president, appointed in 1953, was in the forefront of the movement that culminated in the establishment of a four-year college in 1959. It is significant that the president, as well as most of the staff members, were lifelong residents of the target college community, and that in providing the impetus and leadership for the development of its educational goals, they were responding with particular sensitivity to community aspirations.

One of the governing board members, the editor and publisher of the largest daily newspaper in the area, could recall no opposition to upward extension either from community groups or from individuals within the community. The newspaper itself supported the move through fairly extensive coverage and editorial policies, and the editor could recall no letters objecting to the paper's favorable policy.

Interviews with Chamber of Commerce staff members indicated that all public service groups and clubs within the city, county, and neighboring counties that the college could be expected to serve, approved of the change. Many organizations, including the college's alumni association, participated actively in the campaign to create a four-year college by arranging for faculty and administrators to speak at luncheons and other community group functions, urging groups and clubs to go on record as officially recommending the move, and encouraging individuals and groups to inform their state legislators of their sentiments.

Significant opposition evidently did arise from at least one of the state's universities. Fear of loss of attendance and reduced financial support led staff members and the alumni association to put pressure on their elected representatives and the state educational coordinating council. Many of those interviewed in the target college area felt that such pressures had played an important role in the governor's veto of the legislation authorizing expansion.

## Background: The Comparison College

The background of the comparison college was generally analogous to that of the target college. This school also was located in the second most populous area within its state and also had sought for some years to win approval for upward extension to a four-year college. As was true of the target college, certain political factors played a role in the development of upward extension.

The movement to four-year operation at the comparison college was led by a local legislator, first as a state representative and later as a state senator. At the target college, overt leadership for change had been exercised by the two college presidents who served since 1945. In contrast, the president of the comparison college was less favorably disposed to the change, despite substantial support for the move by board members, faculty, and the community. His reservations centered around concern for the two-year college policies and functions, which he felt would be threatened. He did not, however, take any strong preventive action, and when legislative action finally authorized the four-year college in 1961, he accepted its presidency. It seems evident from these circumstances that even without substantial initiative for academic extension on the part of the chief administrative officer, other forces can generate enough support to prevail.

The legislator who served as prime investigator and catalyst for the extension at the comparison college indicated in an interview that he was primarily influenced by economic and educational factors, but he also cited personal reasons. He commented that in the foreign country of his birth higher educational facilities were not available even for the brightest youths, and he stressed his interest in insuring that such a condition would not persist in this country. He also mentioned that at least four local industries had moved to another state, all having given the lack of educational opportunities as one of the major contributing reasons.

Paralleling the situation of the target college, in this instance also the impetus for the charge was strongly local. Leading figures in the community confirmed that, except for the local papers, all newspapers throughout the state were opposed to upward extension, as were the other state colleges and the university. The legislator interviewed remarked that even after the authorizing legislation had been passed, he had felt forced to threaten to withhold funds for a new medical school at the state university in order to persuade the governor to release funds for the projected changeover. He also made it clear that the leading local industry had been strongly supportive of the establishment of four-year curricula which would provide advanced work and refresher courses for its technicians and engineers.

## Rationale for Upward Extension

Both colleges involved in this study evolved from two-year colleges to four-year colleges during the period of greatly increased college enrollments that followed on the post World War II "baby boom." In both instances, the colleges' rationale for upward extension stressed the increased numbers of youth of college-age seeking higher education. At the target college, for example, it was pointed out that enrollment had doubled between 1940 and 1959 and that between 1958 and 1973 the number of 18-year-old youths in the area would have increased by 121 percent.

The target college enrolled 1,600 youths in 1958 and an enrollment of 4,000 was projected even if the college remained a two-year operation. In addition, the area served by the college expected a population increase of 108 percent by 1975. The comparison college projected a growth in enrollment from 2,000 students in 1964-65 to approximately 5,000 in 1975, or roughly the same proportional growth projected by the target college.

As part of their formal rationale for upward extension, both colleges stressed the financial inability of their students to attend four-year colleges in other areas. A statement released by the target college said:

> A survey of day students (December, 1957) showed that 82 percent would attend ______ College four years if it were a 4-year college, but over half feel they will not be able to afford to go away from home to complete four years of college.
>
> Ninety percent of the evening students stated that they cannot afford to leave [the state] to attend a 4-year college. Eighty-eight percent would attend upper division if it were available [here].

Lowering the cost of four-year college education was perhaps even more important for the comparison college, since family income in the area was especially low.

Another argument consisted of comparisons with neighboring colleges and communities. The target college noted that its enrollment in its two-year operation was larger than that of three of the four Western colleges which had expanded from two to four years. The implications of the lack of four-year college facilities were emphasized by both colleges in various brochures, studies, and legislative presentations. The comparison college, for example, noted that while the area it served contained 22 percent of the state's population, the college accounted for only 15 percent of the students enrolled in four-year state colleges. The estimate was that some 1,027 potential four-year college students were being penalized by the absence of a senior college in the area.

An item on the faculty questionnaire in this study sought to determine how the faculty at the target college perceived the rationale for change: *In your opinion, what were the major reasons for this college to change from a two-year to a four-year operation?*

The replies indicated that in general the faculty was in agreement with the administration and the community, with the majority of responses clustered around the three major points made in the college's formal rationale:

| | Responses |
|---|---|
| In order to meet community needs | 37 |
| In order to meet the growing population increase | 33 |
| In response to public demand | 23 |
| Because students could not afford to complete four years elsewhere | 12 |
| In order to meet statewide needs | 9 |
| In order to serve the college and community status needs | 9 |
| To meet the need for advanced training in certain fields, i.e.; technology, teaching, etc. | 7 |
| Because of state and local political pressures | 6 |

Many other reasons were listed, ranging from the crowding at other state colleges to the need for upgrading the present ones, but most of the responses reflected concurrence with the college's official position—that it was necessary for the college to extend to meet the needs of the community and a growing population, and that it was acting in response to public demand.

Interviews with faculty at both the target and comparison colleges supported the questionnaire response but with considerably more emphasis on faculty and community status needs. One department chairman noted that it was unthinkable for the target college community not to have a four-year college when several less populous and less significant areas in the state had long ago established four-year colleges.

**The Legislation**

The legislation that authorized the target college to become a four-year college included ostensible safeguards for the preservation of certain aspects of the two-year college functions. In interviews, governing board members and administrators especially voiced concern for the future prospects of vocational/technical training and there was also concern for the fate of terminal programs below the baccalaureate level, although the legislation did not specifically link vocational/technical training with sub-baccalaureate programs:

> *Courses of study authorized–School maintained by state.*
>
> The object of the college shall be to teach branches of learning
> in the fields of the sciences and arts as may promote the liberal and
> (3) practical education of students attending. The course of study there-
> (4) in shall be the first two years of college work and in addition thereto
> (5) said college is hereby authorized and directed to offer four years of
> (6) college work in vocational and technical training and industrial tech-
> (7) nology and is further authorized to provide four years of college
> work in the fields of arts and sciences, business, and education; to
> confer bachelor degrees in all of these fields; and to offer all necessary courses of study upon which such degrees are based. The first year of such upper division work is authorized for the school year 1962-63 and the second year of such upper division work is authorized for the school year 1963-64. Said school shall be maintained by the state.

It will be noted that while lines (3) and (4) state that the course of study shall be the first two years of college work, no fields of study or preparation are designated, whereas lines (5) through (7) specifically indicate that courses in vocational/technical and industrial areas shall be offered on a four-year basis. Although there was, in fact, no specific mention of one-year and two-year *terminal* vocational/technical programs, the majority of those interviewed, including administrators and board members, assumed that the continuance of such programs was dictated by legislation and one board member expressed assurance that the present governing board would vigorously oppose any attempt on the part of the college to limit or detract from one-year and two-year curricula. Despite these interpretations, however, it is difficult to see in the legislation any actual legal insistence on the continuance of such programs. Should a future governing board and/or administration see fit to discontinue such programs, they would be acting well within the legal sense of the legislation if not according to its intent.

In order to present its case for upward extension, the college published a brochure in December of 1958 which drew the parameters of the college's commitment to higher education. In this brochure the college described its proposal to offer the baccalaureate degree in such fields as teaching, technology, and nursing. A section was also devoted to emphasizing the two-year function, which the college firmly asserted it would continue to perform:

> The community college function will continue to be implemented through two-year pre-professional courses, terminal courses, and adult education to meet the needs of the community.

It seems obvious that the target college recognized a clear commitment to continue a major portion of the functions of a two-year community college. Administrators, faculty, and governing board members asserted in interviews that at no time did the college overtly attempt to eliminate its junior college functions. They felt it had, in fact, sought to insure their continuance.

The legislative act which authorized the creation of a four-year state college at the comparison college closely paralleled that which authorized the four-year target college.

> The objectives of the ______ College shall be to provide and offer such courses of instruction in the field of liberal arts and sciences as may be determined by said trustees of the State Colleges in ______, and further, may provide and offer instruction in vocational-technical training, industrial technology and adult education on a terminal basis, and to confer all degrees and certificates appropriate to the courses of study offered in said college.

It is evident that this legislation also lacked any legal provision for the continuation of two-year programs. By merely stating that the college might continue terminal vocational/technical programs, it left the determination of curriculum essentially to the board of trustees for state colleges.

Interviews with administrators and the legislator who sponsored the legislation indicated they felt assured, however, that the college was vested with the responsibility for continuing the sub-baccalaureate vocational programs and that the legislation would not have passed if there had been any indication that the college either would not or could not undertake the responsibility for continuing such programs.

## Formal Commitment to Goals and Functions

The functions performed by the two-year public college are designed to serve certain goals and any diminution of these functions is an indication that the goals are less well served. Ideally, these goals are:

> to bring about the democratization of higher education through the extension of the opportunity for post high school education for all throughout life;
>
> to provide for the educational and cultural needs of the community which it serves;
>
> to provide for the development of the widest possible range of talents and abilities within one social institution;
>
> to prepare citizens for full participation in a democratic society.

Not all public two-year colleges, to be sure, perform all of the functions equally or even adequately. For example, considerable concern has been expressed about their failure to provide adequate counseling and guidance services and to establish suitable general education programs (Medsker, 1960). But it seems clear that in its operation as a two-year public community college, the target college did perform the functions that characterize such an institution (see Brick, 1964; Medsker, 1960; and Thornton, 1966). These are to provide:

> lower division four-year college and university parallel courses for students pursuing higher degrees;
>
> one-year and two-year terminal offerings of an occupational nature, including vocational/technical programs;
>
> courses designed to meet the general education needs of *all* students;
>
> adult education courses which meet the occupational, recreational, and cultural needs of the community;
>
> special programs for students seeking higher education who may have educational deficiencies;
>
> close cooperation with the community and responsiveness to its needs for cultural and occupational programs;
>
> counseling and guidance services adequate to serve the above-listed functions and to cope with the needs of a heterogeneous student body.

When the formal commitment of the two institutions to two-year college functions was evaluated by comparing their catalog statements in the last year of their junior college operation and their first as four-year colleges, it was found that the target college's major departure from the accepted functions of the two-year college consisted of the deletion or alteration of the general education program; the comparison college's major departure was the elimination of the remedial function.

## Attitudes of Administrators

During the interviews held with almost all administrators at both colleges, it became clear that there was strong commitment to the goals and functions of the two-year college. The presidents of both schools appeared to be strong champions of the broad spectrum of junior college functions, including vocational programs and "open door" admission policies.

Although the president of the target college had led the movement to extend the college to a four-year operation, he gave every indication of strong belief in the goals of the two-year college. Along with his entire administrative staff, he appeared to be keenly aware of the possibility that two-year college functions could erode within a four-year college setting. The president and dean of the faculty both felt that the target college had a mandate from the state to continue to serve two-year college functions and both administrators also felt that had the college not been able to prove a strong commitment to these functions, the State Legislature might not have acted favorably on the legislation authorizing the upward extension.

Most of the administrative staff recognized that there were forces within the four-year college which sometimes operated to the disadvantage of two-year college functions. The most significant of these forces, they felt, were centered in the new faculty, hired since the changeover. Most frequently without junior college or public school experience, the newer instructors often lacked understanding of and sympathy for the broad range of functions generally found in the two-year college. According to one administrator, the college had more than doubled its teaching faculty within the last few years, and the growth had been so rapid that there had not been time to assimilate all the new people, with the result that many were not yet committed to the multiple objectives of the college. Several administrators did feel that the newer faculty were showing evidence of increased understanding of the broad functions of the college and this they attributed in part to more effective channels of communication between faculty and administration and increased faculty participation in the overall operation of the college.

There was general concurrence among the administrators at the college that the strong commitment to two-year college functions on the part of the president and the dean of the faculty militated against the elimination or substantial reduction of such functions during their tenure. There was some feeling that in the absence of these two men, major efforts might be made to divest the college of two-year functions by placing terminal occupational programs in a separate college, becoming increasingly selective as to student body make-up, and adding programs at the graduate level. Many administrators expected that a master's degree program in education would be in effect shortly, in any event, to meet the needs of teacher certification in the state.

The commitment to continue serving two-year functions at the comparison college was equally strong on the part of the administrative staff. When the college was still in its two-year operation, its president seemed initially to have been somewhat ambivalent toward upward extension, but was later quite supportive of the change and became the four-year college's first president. The current president feels that the college is serving and will continue to serve the functions of the two-year college. As was true at the target college, the administrative staff at the comparison college was aware of the possible erosion of two-year college functions, but expressed less concern about the possible influence of uncommitted or unassimilated faculty.

### Attitudes of the Faculty

The role and authority of the faculty on any given campus is, of course, relative, but there can be little doubt that the faculty can play a decisive part in shaping and implementing educational goals and functions. Millett (1960) took a strong position on the role of the faculty, essentially defining a collegium:

> Instead of being organized upon the principle of a hierarchy of authority, our colleges and universities are organized internally upon the principle of a community of authority [p. 62].

Corson (1960) took what might be considered a more moderate approach to the role of the faculty in the authority structure, but one which nonetheless ascribed considerable power to the faculty in shaping goals and functions:

> In the last analysis authority rests . . . on the ability of the executive to gain the consent and concurrence of those he would lead [p. 88].

Perhaps Buck (1951) best summarized the concern and commitment of faculty in shaping the goals and functions of the college:

> Every aspect of educational policy should be an active and continuous concern of a faculty. Not the least of its concerns should be an awareness of the broader aims of education to which its particular program should be related [pp. 170-171].

It seems clear that faculty attitudes toward the functions that any college performs will help determine whether such functions will successfully meet the goals for which they were designed. While the formal commitment of the college to serve specific goals by performing certain functions is made at the legislative or board of control level, the implementation of these functions rests primarily with the faculty. If faculty members are not in basic agreement with the stated functions of the college, it is unlikely such functions will be adequately served.

It could be assumed that since both the administration of the target college and the local community favored four-year operation, the faculty would also tend to favor this change more than if it were subject to adverse pressures. It is well recognized that the status and economic needs of a junior college faculty are enhanced by the upward extension to a four-year college and that many faculty members would therefore prefer to teach at this level. Medsker (1960) spoke of this dimension of faculty attitude toward two-year and four-year colleges. This concept, called the reference group theory, is pertinent to a consideration of the junior college faculty at the *target college:*

> According to this theory, a person may not be identified primarily with the occupational, social, or economic group of which he is a member. Instead, he may more readily adhere to the views of another group, presumably a group to which he aspires to belong or one with which he wishes to be identified in his own mind or in the minds of others.
>
> Certain junior college staff members may identify themselves with groups outside the college. More particularly, the attitude of junior college teachers may reflect the educational values or attitudes of teachers in four-year colleges and universities [p. 173].

Medsker's study revealed that sometimes as many as one-half of the instructional staff of a junior college would prefer to teach in a four-year college or university.

The commitment of the faculty toward continuance of functions which serve the goals of a two-year college was gauged in three ways: Faculty members at the target college were asked to respond to questionnaire items regarding these functions; additional comments regarding these functions were solicited on the questionnaire; and a number of faculty members were interviewed at both the target and comparison colleges.

One item on the questionnaire sought to determine to what extent faculty at the target college had favored the change from a two-year to four-year operation. Among faculty interviewed, none voiced opposition or indicated they had opposed upward extension at the time it was introduced, or had been aware of opposition either within the college or in the surrounding community. Older faculty at both colleges indicated that while there was no formal opposition to extension, some members of the vocational/technical faculties expressed support contingent upon the continuance of occupational programs below the baccalaureate level. Several faculty members at the comparison college had been aware of the president's initial opposition before his later support.

As a gauge of faculty commitment to junior college functions, several items on the faculty questionnaire were designed to sample attitudes toward functions generally considered characteristic of the public junior college. All but one of the functions covered by the questions were performed by the target college in its two-year operation. Further, as a four-year college, it was formally committed to maintaining all but one of these functions.

As noted earlier, the faculty was divided into two groups: those who were employed at the time the target college was a two-year operation and those who were employed after the transition. It was suggested as a working hypothesis that older faculty, i.e., those employed by the two-year college, would be more sympathetic than newer faculty to the functions generally performed by the junior colleges. This hypothesis was predicated upon several assumptions:

> that older faculty, having taught in a junior college, would continue to be more sympathetic toward the functions which served the goals of such colleges;
>
> that few of the newer faculty would have taught in a two-year college and therefore would be less sympathetic;
>
> that more of the older faculty would have had experience in secondary and elementary education than the newer faculty, and that since public school goals are closely akin to those of the junior college, they would tend to be more sympathetic toward the goals of a two-year college;

that administrators would be more supportive of the two-year college goals than faculty and that those faculty members with administrative experience would therefore be more supportive of the junior college;

that older faculty members with more public school experience would also have had more administrative experience than new faculty.

To determine the validity of these assumptions, two questionnaire items were directed toward prior teaching and administrative experience. The responses showed that over 73 percent of the older faculty had had secondary school experience versus only about 30 percent of the newer faculty, about 20 percent of the older faculty also had had secondary school administrative experience versus slightly over 5 percent of the newer faculty, and a substantially larger number of newer faculty had four-year college or university teaching and/or administrative experience in such institutions. Interviews at the comparison college revealed similar responses.

Since developmental or remedial courses are generally offered to junior college students, many of whom enter college with inadequate preparation, skills, or motivation, a questionnaire item sought to gauge faculty commitment to this function by asking whether the college should offer remedial courses for students whose educational background indicated they had little chance for success in college.

While the majority of faculty respondents were in favor, over 43 percent thought it should be discontinued. The newer faculty was clearly less favorable to remedial course work than the older faculty, and even among those in favor, 18 made additional comments that indicated important reservations. Of these, 12 felt remedial work should be offered only in evening or extension courses, not as part of the day credit program. Several felt that for such courses the student should pay all or at least a larger proportion of the total cost incurred by the college. Since the majority of students requiring remedial courses might be presumed to come from the lower socioeconomic strata, the imposition of additional costs for such courses obviously has serious implications.

Interviews indicated that administrators were more inclined toward offering remedial courses than either faculty or governing board members and that most older faculty were favorable to the continued inclusion of remedial work, while only in certain departments, e.g., education, did new faculty express a favorable viewpoint. In the course of time, as older faculty retire, and a larger proportion of newer faculty replace them or are added to the staff, serious questions about the survival of remedial courses may arise.

Faculty members interviewed at the comparison college were even less supportive of the remedial function. One member commented that "... to offer such courses would effectively limit the status and image which we need to develop as a four-year college." A stronger negative attitude toward this function at the comparison college was expected since it had dropped some courses and commitment to this function when it became a four-year institution.

The item on the faculty questionnaire that sought to determine attitudes toward awarding the associate degree yielded the information that overall, the faculty respondents were slightly less in favor of continuing to award the two-year degree than it was of continuing to provide the remedial course work. A larger percentage of newer faculty than older faculty was unfavorably disposed to the degree. The newer faculty voted negatively on both functions in almost the same proportion–over 47 percent. Several who responded affirmatively added comments to the effect that such degrees should be restricted to certain departments, for example, "Only in technical divisions." Some negative comments from respondents expressed the opinion that the degree "Seems to be no longer meaningful except for terminal/technical students." A view that the associate degree be restricted to the technical departments for terminal students may point to a lack of knowledge about the college policy toward such degrees. Generally, neither junior colleges nor four-year colleges award the associate degree for terminal students; students completing a one-year or two-year terminal occupational program receive certificates. The associate degree is awarded to students who complete a lower division transfer program of either an occupational or a general nature.

Interviews at the comparison college revealed a somewhat more negative attitude toward the two-year degree than at the target college. This was due, in part, to the ambiguous nature of the degree. Although a 2.0 (C) grade point average is necessary for the associate degree that would enable a student to continue for the baccalaureate, the college catalog was somewhat contradictory on this point:

> The associate in arts degree is also conferred as a terminal degree for those students who may nor or cannot continue to work toward the baccalaureate degree.

One administrator stated that the college should award such a degree for students not eligible to continue for the baccalaureate degree. This would seemingly place a stigma on such a degree, however, and probably relegate it to the category of a negative status symbol.

It was evident that there was so much ambiguity about the two-year degree and antipathy toward it among the faculty in both colleges that its continuance in either college is open to doubt. The target college did not award it to terminal two-year students at all while the comparison college was unclear as to when it should be awarded. At neither college was there any conviction that the degree served a valid function as a goal or reward for terminal students.

The faculty questionnaire also sought faculty response to a function which is relatively new to the two-year college–compensatory educational programs for the "culturally disadvantaged" when the need is demonstrated. Of the 68 newer faculty members who responded, 45 were in favor, and of the 35 older faculty respondents, 29 were in favor.

This topical question concerned an area of service specifically performed neither by the junior college nor by the four-year college. The urgency of programs for "culturally disadvantaged" youth has significantly involved the public junior colleges only in the last few years. Many think the public junior college is the natural institution to perform this function and the junior colleges have generally been responsive to this challenge. This question attempted to gauge to what extent the target college faculty was favorable toward the undertaking of a new function to which, generally speaking, the public junior colleges have fallen heir. It is noteworthy that the total faculty was much more supportive of this function than of those which have long been accepted as legitimate junior college functions.

It is difficult to account for the large favorable response to this function, but the following factors may be relevant: The question was a directed one and carried a possible double implication; the leading church in the area had suffered some criticism for its policies toward minority groups and this may have been seen by some faculty as an opportunity to counter charges of discrimination in the community; the need for compensatory education has been receiving national attention in recent years through federal and state legislation and faculty members might well wish experience with such programs; and the novelty of the idea may have been attractive. The area which the college serves has a very small percentage of minority groups (2.7 percent nonwhite) and faculty members may have thought there was no possibility of such programs being established in the target college anyway. Whatever the reason for such a large favorable response, it does indicate a certain sympathy with newer functions which are accruing to the public two-year colleges.

At the comparison college, faculty and administrators expressed great personal sympathy with such programs but serious doubts about their place within the four-year college environment. The majority of those interviewed at the comparison college were opposed to this function although the area it serves has a higher percentage of minority, foreign born, and lower socioeconomic groups than the area served by the target college.

Faculty response to an item about the offering of evening and/or adult noncredit courses for the general public did not support the hypothesis that older faculty would be more supportive of generally accepted two-year college functions than newer faculty. It seemed evident from the over 90 percent favorable response that the respondents overwhelmingly supported this function, and some light on the reasons for the markedly strong support was shed in the interviews. Many faculty members taught courses in the evening for extra pay, and several of those interviewed, including administrators, felt that this way of supplementing regular faculty salary may have been more important to newer and hence younger and lower-paid faculty members with larger families to support. Although interviews at the comparison college did not indicate such strong support for this function, a clear majority of faculty and administrators were in favor of its retention.

An item on the faculty questionnaire that pertained to the community service aspect of the college program, such as the offering of concert and lecture series, elicited the least percentage of negative responses of any item on the questionnaire. The heavy support may be accounted for by the fact that virtually all faculty live in the immediate community and that the college has, in effect, become the locus of cultural activity for the surrounding area. Evidence from interviews and records of earlier community service programs would indicate this was true even when the college was a two-year operation, and that the college looked to the community for financial support through paid attendance at college-sponsored events. It was also felt that such activities played a major role in shaping a favorable public image.

The response at the comparison college indicated the same degree of support found at the target college and several of those interviewed on both campuses felt that the colleges should do even more toward contributing to the cultural and educational development of the adult community. It was generally noted, however, that all such activities should be self-supporting.

It is highly unlikely that the move to a four-year operation poses any threat to the continuance of community service programs; the move may, indeed, tend to enhance and enlarge this function. Without exception, high school administrators, counselors, and several leading members in the community of the target college felt that the four-year college was making a more significant contribution than the two-year college had in terms of community service. They felt that the prestige and status of the community had been enhanced and that cultural activity in the community had received significant impetus. As evidence, they pointed to better theatrical and musical productions, more national and international speakers, better attended art shows, and increased numbers of displays and exhibits. It was noted that the new auditorium-fine arts complex and new library facilities were authorized only after the legislation for upward extension was passed. The interviewees felt that the college's cultural and athletic events were well attended by the general public, and agreed that, in general, the cultural contribution of the four-year college to the community was significantly greater and of higher quality than that of the two-year college had been.

Strong support for short-term vocational/technical programs, often given on a temporary basis, was evidenced by the faculty response to the following question: *Should the college cooperate with outside agencies in offering special vocational/technical programs designed to meet immediate occupational needs?* Although there was no appreciable difference in the response between older and newer faculty (among respondents, 75 of the 78 newer faculty were in favor, as were 39 of the 41 older faculty), there were, nevertheless, several reservations expressed as additional comments. Typical remarks were: "Only through a separate school," and "Yes, but keep the college and college objectives in mind—limit these programs."

Interviews with target college faculty indicated another area of strong concern which was not specifically tapped by the questionnaire. Many faculty members felt strongly that such programs should only be offered if no expense accrued to the college, and that funds should not come from the normal operating budget of the target college, nor from the state legislature, but rather from private or perhaps Federal sources.

Interviews at the comparison college generally revealed the same support for these vocational/technical programs, also with reservations about the source of financing. An additional concern expressed at the comparison college was that students in such programs should not be considered college level students. Again, interviews at both colleges revealed considerably less support for this function than was indicated by the questionnaire returns.

A question attempting to gauge faculty attitude toward vocational curricula below the bachelor's degree level elicited an overwhelmingly positive response for continuation from both older and newer faculty. Although a somewhat higher percentage of newer than older faculty supported this function, the difference was not considered important. The interviews also indicated great support for these curricula although a surprising number of faculty and administrators wished to see a separate junior college established by the community to take over this and possibly other functions now performed by the four-year target college. Said one, for example, "Now that we have become a four-year state college it would seem reasonable to re-establish a junior college [in the community] to take over some of the programs that a junior college does better than we, and let us concentrate on things a four-year college is supposed to do." Some support for this view was reflected by comments on the questionnaire: "Should be done by a trade/technical school"; "Through separate school."

This attitude was not restricted to faculty and administration but was shared by some trustees and members of the community. One trustee felt the idea of establishing a new junior college should be considered, but that its establishment would run counter to the declared goals of the four-year college and would impose an impossible tax burden on either the state or community, thus working to the detriment of adequate financing for the target college.

Interviews at the comparison college also indicated firm support for vocational/technical curricula, but once again the idea of establishing a junior college for the purpose was proposed. The vocational/technical faculty interviewed were 100 percent in favor of preserving this function; the rather small number opposed was largely from the liberal arts faculty.

In short, while there appeared to be considerable support for vocational programs below the baccalaureate level, many faculty evidently would have preferred to transfer this function to another type of institution and were supportive of it in the four-year college only because another institution they considered more suitable was not available.

Those who responded in the affirmative to the question about the continuation of sub-baccalaureate vocational curricula were posed a related question: *Should such vocational curricula include general education courses?* While the majority of faculty who responded were in favor, a smaller percentage of the newer faculty than older faculty were included (approximately 73 percent versus 89 percent, respectively.)

Interviews at the comparison college substantiated the commitment to general education through departmental offerings of an introductory or survey nature. Unlike the target college, however, it had not previously offered specific courses of an interdisciplinary nature to meet general education purposes. The faculty was largely supportive of this function, but felt it was adequately served through departmental offerings.

With respect to counseling and guidance services, the majority of the faculty respondents at the target college seemed clearly not only to value them but to want to have them expanded. The reasons for the less favorable response of the older faculty members remain obscure. Interviews shed little light on this subject and additional comments on the questionnaire were of little help because of the diversity of viewpoints expressed: "Expansion needed at departmental level"; "Improvement desirable"; "In some way to do a better job than what we now do."

Interviews with faculty at the comparison college indicated even more support for the counseling and guidance function. As was also true at the target college, the comparison college faculty had some reservations about the way in which the present counseling and guidance services were implemented, but there appeared to be a clear recognition of their value and necessity.

**In summary:** The newer faculty was found to be less supportive of generally accepted two-year college functions than older faculty with respect to offering compensatory and remedial courses, continuing the associate degree, and including general education in vocational programs. On the other hand, newer faculty were slightly more supportive of evening and/or adult noncredit courses, community service programs, special vocational/technical programs, vocational curricula below the bachelor's level, and expanded counseling and guidance services.

While none of the items evoked less than 50 percent support from responding faculty members, well over 40 percent of them were opposed to offering remedial courses and awarding the associate degree. This high negative response, combined with the antipathy toward these functions revealed in the interviews, suggest that their continuance must be considered doubtful.

Although over 70 percent of the faculty that responded to the questionnaire was in favor of compensatory educational programs when the need for them was demonstrated, those who were interviewed indicated less support or a more conditional one: They approved only if other educational agencies were unable or unwilling to undertake such programs.

A clear and in most instances striking majority of faculty, according to questionnaire responses, favored the continuance of adult courses, community service programs, special vocational/technical programs, vocational curricula below the bachelor's level, including general education, and an expansion of the counseling and guidance function. Many, however, had reservations, and less support was expressed in interviews on both campuses than in questionnaire responses.

## Attitudes of the Trustees

Effective July 1, 1961, the control of the target college passed from the state board of education to a new board of trustees. Provisions for this transfer were effected by an act of the 1961 state legislature, which provided for 12 governing board members, to be appointed by the governor for four-year terms and approved by the state senate. The secretary of state and the president of the alumni association serve as ex-officio members of the board without pay other than reimbursement for expenses incurred as trustees.

The 1965-66 board of trustees consisted of four attorneys, three bankers, a cleric, a drugstore operator, a real estate and insurance agent, a wife of an attorney, and a newspaper publisher. It must be inferred from this middle-class and upper middle-class makeup of the board that no attempt was made to include a cross-section of the general public in this influential body. Not only was there no representation from the lower socioeconomic strata, but neither trade unions, farmers, nor minority groups were represented.

Two board members, residents of the target college community, both felt that the college was serving and would continue to serve the functions of a two-year college, that the board was completely committed to continuing programs of a junior college nature, and that no threat to the curtailment of such programs existed. Further, both were assured that the legal provisions of the legislation authorizing upward extension would adequately forestall any attempts, internal or external to the college, to eliminate or negate the goals of the two-year college. One of the men made the point that a firmly expressed conviction by the target college that it should continue such functions was probably prerequisite to getting legislative sanction for the upward extension.

The comparison college operated under a seven-member board of trustees and two ex-officio members who had all of the state colleges under their jurisdiction. Because an adequate number of trustees could not be interviewed, a questionnaire based largely on the faculty questionnaire was designed and sent to all trustees at both colleges to determine the attitudes of the trustees toward two-year college functions (Appendix B). A return of 64 percent from the target college and 86 percent from the comparison college was received.

The responses to the first three items on the trustee questionnaire were reported earlier in this chapter. Responses to the next item, which sought to gauge trustee attitude toward the remedial function generally performed by the two-year college, gave evidence of commitment to this function on the part of responding trustees at both colleges, with six of the nine target college trustees and all five of those at the comparison college in favor.

The majority of both sets of responding trustees also were in favor of continuing to award the two-year associate of arts and associate of science degrees (six out of nine at the target college; all six at the comparison college) and of offering compensatory educational programs (six out of nine at the target college; five out of six at the comparison college), but it is clear that on both points there was less division of opinion at the comparison college.

There was no difference between the two groups of trustees, however, on whether the colleges should continue to offer evening and/or noncredit courses for the general public. This function received 100 percent support from the responding trustees of both campuses, which undoubtedly indicates sensitivity and responsiveness to the general public served by the two colleges. Support was again strong, but not unanimous, for the providing of cultural programs of a general nature by the college, with all of the six responding trustees of the comparison college in favor, and seven out of nine target college trustees favorably disposed.

Both sets of trustees were unanimous, however, in their agreement with the idea of cooperation with outside agencies in offering special vocational/technical programs designed to meet immediate occupational needs, although there was less support for vocational curricula below the baccalaureate level from the target college trustees than from the comparison college: Only six out of nine of the former, but all six of the latter indicated approval.

An additional question attached to this item concerned the inclusion of general education courses with the sub-baccalaureate occupational programs. Four of those who had marked "yes" to the initial question abstained from this one, but of the eight who replied to it, all were in favor. Thus, the majority of those responding favorably to the continuance of vocational programs felt that general education courses should be part of such curricula, and none in favor felt that general education courses should *not* be included, but some evidently preferred to remain neutral on this point.

The trustees viewed the counseling and guidance functions in their particular colleges somewhat differently. All six of the comparison college respondents felt there was a need for expansion of these services, but only four out of nine from the target college thought this. While the need for expanded counseling and guidance services at the comparison college might indeed be greater, it also seemed likely that the trustees of this school may have been more aware of the necessity for such services in a college nominally committed to serving a heterogeneous student body, such as that found in a public junior college.

Queried as to whether they thought their colleges had been able to maintain their two-year functions, 14 of the 15 respondents replied in the affirmative, the negative voice coming from the comparison college. But only 13 trustees–eight from the target college and five from the comparison college–responded to the question about whether the college would be able to continue these functions, albeit all these responses were in the affirmative.

To the last section of the question, which asked which functions have not been maintained and why, there was no specific response other than that the college had shaken off its two-year image.

The final question on this trustee questionnaire was: *Have you detected any pressures to discontinue any of the functions listed in Questions 1 through 12? If yes, which ones and from where have the pressures come?*

The three affirmative responses from trustees of the target colleges all indicated that pressure had been exerted to discontinue vocational programs at the sub-baccalaureate level: "Members of the Board, as well as faculty desire to terminate some academic areas not leading to a B. S. degree"; "Some feeling that the image of a senior college is hurt by continuing vocational classes." Another noted that pressures originated with ". . . Board members and parents of students receiving baccalaureate degrees."

At the comparison college, a larger percentage of the trustees was aware of pressures to discontinue. Three of the trustees responding "yes" to this question indicated that the pressures were coming from the faculty, and one noted that the students themselves were inclined toward the more prestigious courses. Another trustee noted that the community as well as the academic faculty would like to raise the college to university status.

**In summary:** It is evident from the interviews and the questionnaire that the trustees of both colleges were strongly supportive of the functions usually assigned to the two-year public college. On the basis of the questionnaire returns, it was also evident that the trustees of the target college were somewhat less supportive of some functions–such as remedial education, compensatory education, the associate degree programs, vocational curricula below the baccalaureate level, and community service programs–than were the trustees of the comparison college. The latter were also more inclined to support the expansion of counseling and guidance services.

Both groups of trustees thought their respective colleges had been able to maintain two-year functions and asserted they would continue to do so. But it was clear that all members were aware of pressures to discontinue some of these. These pressures, evidently considerably stronger at the comparison college, were attributed by all trustees to the drives of board members, faculty, parents, and students.

### Curriculum

Ideally, the curriculum of the two-year community college includes a wide range of course offerings and programs designed to meet the diverse needs and abilities of the wide range of students it attracts. Medsker (1960) spoke to this point:

> The diversity of its student body imposes on the two-year college the responsibility of providing an equally diverse educational program . . .
>
> That the college recognizes its responsibility for program diversity is evident by the functions it generally assumes [p. 51].

One of the core areas of the junior college curriculum is generally considered to be that of the general education programs. It was noted earlier in this chapter that the target college had dropped general education courses of an interdisciplinary nature during its transition from a two-year to a four-year college. In its two-year operation, the divisions of Humanities, Life Sciences, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences had all offered broad and often interdisciplinary courses designed for the nonmajor. A statement of the Department of General Education for Physical Science within the Division of Physical Science indicates their purpose:

> These courses are designed primarily for the non-physical science and non-engineering majors and aim to develop within the student:
>
> 1. An understanding and appreciation of the fundamental laws and principles of the physical universe, and their influence upon the history and behavior of mankind.

> 2. An understanding of scientific progress both past and present, and its impact upon world affairs.
>
> 3. A desire to apply the scientific method of acquiring knowledge, to think clearly, to develop sound judgment, intellectual honesty and personal integrity.

The description of the following course exemplifies courses offered to fulfill such purposes:

> *Integration of Physical Science.* A general education course which aims to achieve the objectives of ______ College and those departmental objectives listed above by drawing instructional material from the fields of Astronomy, Physics and Meteorology.

It is open to question whether lower division departmental offerings of a survey or introductory nature can serve the same purpose as general education courses specifically designed as such to achieve certain clear goals. Medsker has noted that, "Although it may be granted that such a course makes some contribution, it is hardly the best medium for the purpose." It is generally accepted that courses designed to meet general education objectives are especially relevant to the junior college because of the diverse nature of its student body, the majority of whom end their formal education in this institution. In further substantiation is Bogue's (1950) view that programs planned to meet the needs of general education should be the heart of the community college.

> . . . general education is one of the constants in basic functions of community colleges. It continues in all communities, for all people, regardless of the ever-changing industrial, business, agricultural, and professional methods of their variations between communities. Unless an institution performs this function well, it cannot claim to be a junior or community college [p. 164].

While it would thus seem that the target college took a significant step away from meeting its commitment to junior college functions by eliminating its specially designed general education courses, this step must be weighed against the realities of practice. Medsker found that of the two-year colleges studied in his sample, 77 percent relied on conventional lower division survey or introductory courses to meet general education needs. In this respect, therefore, the target college evidently fulfills this function in the same way that the majority of two-year colleges do. As a two-year college, however, it had been among that minority of institutions which recognizes the importance of courses specifically designed to meet general education needs, and its present policy is clearly a philosophical departure from that stance.

The commitment of the public two-year college to terminal programs of two years' duration or less is so strong as to require no further documentation, and a comparison between the two-year and four-year curricular offerings at the target college reveals some changes but no decrease in this kind of program: The number of two-year occupational programs in the Division of Technical Education has remained constant, although several were dropped and new ones added. The Division of Business and Economics dropped several two-year terminal programs, but it is important to note that the courses for such programs still exist and may be used by two-year students for any purposes other than certification. And in the general field of Health Sciences, two new two-year programs have been begun. It may thus be concluded that in the number of one-year and two-year occupational programs offered, the target college has not only maintained those offered in the junior college, but in some areas has added new programs. This gain is in addition to several four-year vocational/technical programs for engineers below the degree level. Two additional occupational programs also were added at the comparison college.

Thus, both colleges involved in the study actually increased the number of two-year vocational curricula somewhat, and during the three years since the last year of two-year college operation, both also added four-year curricula in engineering technology.

However, while both institutions showed a slight increase in the number of two-year vocational curricula offered, there was both a proportional and numerical decline in enrollments of declared majors in such programs at the target college, and the greater proportionate increase at the comparison college was nevertheless not in line with its overall growth in enrollment (Table 1, 2).

TABLE 1. ENROLLMENTS IN TERMINAL/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS, TARGET COLLEGE: AUTUMN, 1961 AND 1965*

| | 1961 | 1965 |
|---|---|---|
| College enrollment by FTE | 2,707 | 5,711 |
| Students in 11 terminal programs | 441 | 365 |
| Percent of enrollment in 11 terminal programs | 16 | 6 |

*These figures do not include Business Department enrollments.

While Office Administration is listed as a terminal program in 1965-66, it was not possible to compare it with the terminal programs in the Business Departments for 1961-62, since no differentiation was made in that year between terminal and transfer students in that department. It is pertinent, however, to note that the total number of students enrolled as declared business majors in both two-year and four-year programs declined from 334 in 1961 to 296 in 1965.

TABLE 2. ENROLLMENTS IN TERMINAL/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS, COMPARISON COLLEGE: AUTUMN, 1961 AND 1965

| | 1961 | 1965 |
|---|---|---|
| College enrollment by FTE | 1,435 | 3,937 |
| Students in 14 terminal programs | 201 | 470 |
| Percent of enrollment in 14 terminal programs | 14.0 | 11.9 |

Apart from one-year and two-year vocational curricula, both colleges continue to offer short-term technical training programs designed to meet the immediate needs of local business and industry. These programs have undergone some acceleration at the target college in response to developments at a local defense installation. As many as 400 people received some college-connected training at the target college during 1966-67. This college also continues to offer remedial courses, although the comparison college has dropped some such courses.

Perhaps more students are now in four-year vocational curricula who would have been enrolled in two-year vocational curricula before upward extension took place. But a comparison of the numbers of declared majors at the target college in both two-year and four-year programs in the Division of Technical Education in 1961 and 1965 indicates that enrollments in this division have not kept proportionate pace with the enrollment growth of the college (Table 3).

TABLE 3. ENROLLMENTS IN DIVISION OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION, TARGET COLLEGE: AUTUMN, 1961 AND 1965*

| | 1961 | 1965 |
|---|---|---|
| College enrollment by FTE | 2,707 | 5,711 |
| Students in Division of Technical Education | 336 | 410 |
| Percent of enrollment in Division of Technical Education | 12.4 | 7.2 |

*Figures were unavailable for the agriculture and nursing programs. Thus, while the percentages are valid for comparison purposes, they do not represent the true percentages of total students enrolled in the Division of Technical Education for either year.

It should be noted that many undeclared majors, or general students, take course work in terminal/vocational programs and that some of these students complete two-year vocational programs. This was true in the two-year as well as in the four-year college, however, and there is no reason to assume that the proportions of undeclared majors who either take vocational course work or eventually complete a two-year terminal program are greater in the four-year college.

## Tuition and Fees

The two-year public community college is generally conceived of as a tuition-free or low-cost institution which, by reducing the cost of higher education, can draw students from a broad spectrum of the general public, including those from the lower socioeconomic strata of society. The junior college thus serves as a democratizing institution in higher education.

Practice varies regarding tuition charges in the public two-year college: For example, while there is no legal provision for tuition in California and fees are authorized only for parking and health services, New York requires that one-third of the operating costs of the college be borne by tuition. There is general agreement among junior college spokesmen, however, that the goals of such colleges cannot be served without the absence or minimization of costs to the student. An early study by Koos (1944) revealed that more students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds entered two-year colleges when no tuition was charged, thus providing for the democratization of higher education in a meaningful way. The President's Commission on Higher Education (1948) recommended that public education through the 13th and 14th years be tuition-free for all, regardless of economic background or social status.

Fariss (1947) reported that the Committee on Legislation of the American Association of Junior Colleges strongly recommended that laws be enacted to provide for nationwide free tuition in two-year colleges. This committee recognized that large numbers of able high school graduates were kept from college by financial barriers and that the tuition-free junior college could encourage many to complete two years of college while living at home. Public education through grades 13 and 14 is rapidly becoming a national goal. The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association proposed this in 1964, and in 1966 the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress added its voice to urge universal education through the first two college years.

Perhaps Thornton (1966) has best summed up both the current situation and professional thinking *vis a vis* tuition in the two-year college:

> Although present practice in tuition charges varies widely from state to state and even within states, both the philosophy and the functions of the community college require that the cost to the student be kept as low as possible. State laws should therefore permit and encourage local junior college districts to offer tuition-free instruction to district residents. Non-junior college districts may well be required to pay the costs of instruction in lieu of tuition for those of their residents who attend a neighboring junior college. In this way the opportunities for higher education in America will become more nearly equal [p. 99].

Studies indicate that throughout the nation the primary reason for founding public two-year colleges has been to provide post secondary educational opportunities for young people who cannot afford to attend existing institutions of higher education. Bogue (1953), for example, reported a study by Salwak which investigated the reasons given for the establishment of 77 junior colleges in 23 states between 1940 and 1953. Almost all of the administrators of the colleges stated that they provided opportunities for young people unable to attend other institutions. In addition, the large number of junior college students who hold full- or part-time jobs attests to their financial situation. D'Amico and Raines (1957) found that in one entering class at Flint Junior College in Michigan, 57 percent of the students were gainfully employed. About 63 percent of the men and 47 percent of the women engaged in some form of part-time work, with the median number of hours worked per week being 20.4. In response to the question, *If you did not work, would you or your family be able to meet your college expenses?* almost half of those employed answered "No."

In reporting on dropout self-studies by 20 junior colleges between 1949 and 1957, Medsker found that the single reason given most often by students for withdrawing before attaining their educational goals was to accept full-time employment.

If a four-year college proposes to serve the same goals and perform the same functions as a junior college, then it must make provision for attendance by a large segment of students from low-income families. Table 4 shows the tuition and fee schedules of the target college as a two-year operation and as a four-year one.

### TABLE 4. TARGET COLLEGE: TUITION AND FEES AS A TWO-YEAR AND FOUR-YEAR OPERATION

| | Two-Year College 1961-62 | Four-Year College 1965-66 | Percent Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| Resident | $145.00 | $249.00 | 72 |
| Nonresident | $210.00 | $513.00 | 144 |
| Special student (less than 10 units) | $3.50 (per unit) | $6.50 (per unit) | 86 |
| Auditor (per course) | $5.00 | $10.00 | 100 |
| Summer school | $41.00 | $68.00 | 66 |
| Evening courses (minimum per quarter registration fee) | $2.50 | $3.50 | 40 |

According to figures published by the U. S. Office of Education in 1964, the median tuition rate in public junior colleges, based only on those colleges which charged tuition, was $113.00 in 1962-63. In the western states, however, in which category the target college falls, the median tuition charge was only $60. The target college's tuition and fee costs were not only higher than those of the two-year colleges within its own area, but they were also higher than those of the other four-year state colleges in the western states. The average tuition and fee charges for state colleges in those states in 1965-66 were $222, compared with $249 at the target college.

Statistics further showed that in the four-year target college, student fees not only covered a larger share of the total cost per lower division full-time student, but the total amount expended per lower division full-time student actually decreased between 1961-62 and 1965-66. In 1961-62 student fees covered 16 percent of the $692 spent on each lower division full-time student, while in 1965-66 student fees accounted for 24 percent of the $652 expenditure per student. Thus, not only were student fees supporting 8 percent more of the total per student expenditure, but the expenditure itself had dropped by $40.

While it is obvious that the target college, in its operation as a junior college, did not fully subscribe to the free admission policy which ideally characterizes public junior colleges, it is equally obvious that as a four-year college it has moved significantly further from such a policy. The most dramatic rise reflected here is for the nonresident student. In this regard, the college seems to present an interesting contradiction. While attempts have been made to attract faculty from different cultural backgrounds and from different parts of the country, at the same time steps have been taken to insure that the student body remain homogeneous in cultural background and geographic point of origin. Given a normal pattern of tuition and fees, it might be expected that a four-year college would attract more nonresident students, i.e., students from a wider cultural and geographic background, than a junior college. However, by adding tuition and fees of more than $500 a year for the nonresident student to the expenses incurred by living away from home, the target college seems to have acted to preclude the possibility of developing a more heterogeneous student body.

As of 1965, the target college ranked below the other two state colleges and the state university in resident tuition, but above the other two-year colleges within the state. In nonresident tuition, it ranked above one of the other state colleges and the university. Interviews revealed that most administrators and faculty felt the target college should and eventually would have the same resident and nonresident tuition and fee rate as the four-year colleges and the university within the state. The target college, however, is the only one of the state-supported four-year colleges committed to performing the functions and serving the goals of the two-year public college.

Combining all categories of tuition and fees listed in Table 4, it can be seen that on the average, they were raised something over 80 percent. Since this rise reflects neither the local or national rise in the cost of living index, nor the average rise in tuition and fees for public two-year or four-year colleges across the country, it is difficult to attribute it to anything other than the somewhat inadequate financing of the move to the four-year operation. The target college is therefore bound to present additional financial barriers which will work to the detriment of students who would normally attend a two-year public community college, especially those who might seek to take advantage of terminal programs within the four-year college. It is especially worth noting that the per unit cost for special students, i.e., students taking less than ten units, increased about 85 percent during this five year period. This rise is particularly significant since a great many students who are attracted to the junior college are able to attend only part time because of financial obligations and commitments, and the added fact that such students generally come from the lower socioeconomic strata of society. It would thus seem questionable whether the target college, as a four-year institution, can continue to perform the function of being a democratizing agent within the framework of higher education.

Increases in tuition and fees were even more dramatic at the comparison college than at the target college. Table 5 reveals a rise of over 300 percent for both resident and nonresident students, with the greatest increase—359 percent—falling to the resident trade-technical student.

TABLE 5. COMPARISON COLLEGE: TUITION AND FEES AS A TWO-YEAR AND FOUR-YEAR OPERATION.

| | Junior College 1962-63 | Four-Year College 1966-67 | Percentage Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| Resident (Trade-technical)* | $81.00 | $261.00 | 322 |
| | | $291.00 | 359 |
| Nonresident (Trade-technical)* | $163.00 | $510.00 | 318 |
| | | $540.00 | 331 |

*Trade-technical students at the two-year college were charged additional fees ranging from $2.50 to $12.00 per quarter, depending upon their courses.

The item on the target college faculty questionnaire concerning the current tuition and fee charges at the target college got the following response: A clear majority of both old and new faculty (60 percent and almost 56 percent, respectively) felt tuition and fees should be raised. This response from the older faculty was somewhat unexpected in light of their greater public school and junior college experience, but it may be that the newer faculty, younger in age, were more able to empathize with students regarding expenses, or were more intimately aware of the consequences of increased college costs.

Several volunteered comments addended to the questionnaire were to the point that tuition for out-of-state students should be raised considerably, one to the effect that there should be a raise "in keeping with the cost of living," and another that there should be a raise "to meet the needs of the college." It was a weakness of the questionnaire that neither percentage nor actual dollar raises per year or quarter were specified. Of the six recommendations which did specify sums per quarter, the range mentioned was from $10 to $100, with an average of $23 per quarter. Of the four responses recommending percentage increases, the range was from 10 to 40 percent and averaged 24 percent. Equating the two approaches to dollars per year, the average percentage raise recommended was about $60 per year and the average raise in dollars about $70 per year. There was thus evidently general agreement among faculty who responded to the questionnaire that tuition and/or fees should be increased by $60 to $70 per year.

Almost all faculty members interviewed at both the target college and the comparison college lamented the increase in tuition and fees, but they also felt that it was a realistic necessity in view of the greater cost of upper division courses arising essentially from smaller classes. Especially at the target college, the faculty felt that further raises were necessary and, indeed, inevitable, since their funding from the state was inadequate. Several stated that the legislature was loath to provide more funds unless and until the college had "done its share" by maximizing tuition and fee income. The trustees' response to the question about tuition and fees showed a split between the two colleges. While the trustees of the target college felt overwhelmingly that tuition and fees should be raised, the trustees of the comparison college were just as clearly opposed to such increases. This is perhaps partially attributable to the greater percentage increase already made by the comparison college.

**In summary:** Both the target college and the comparison college have substantially raised their tuition and fees, thus creating a financial burden for the type of student traditionally attracted to the junior college. In addition, judging by faculty and trustee attitudes and recommendations that have been made, it would seem likely that tuition and fees will probably continue to rise at the target college between 20 and 30 percent.

Neither the target college nor the comparison college has been able to maintain the low-cost or free admission policy that has tended to characterize the public two-year college. Since one of the reasons given by both colleges for engaging in upward extension was that it would ease the financial burden of attending four-year colleges away from home, it might be asked if the more than 80 percent average rise in tuition and fees at the target college and the over 300 percent rise for resident students at the comparison college did not tend to cancel, to some extent, the financial advantage to young people of having a local four-year community college.

It is axiomatic that increased tuition and fee costs constitute a major hardship for the great numbers of youths from the lower socioeconomic strata who nationally comprise more than 50 percent of the two-year college student body.

### Admission Policy

The public two-year college is usually characterized by its relatively open admission policy. In most states it accepts all high school graduates and in many states it accepts non-high school graduates. Havighurst and Neugarten (1957) linked the term "opportunity college" with the two-year college.

> Opportunity college . . . is always characterized by low costs, easy admission standards and a predominance of students from working-class families . . . [p. 255].

Clark (1960) noted that the "... 'open door' is a primary attribute of the American junior college, especially the locally controlled version." In California, the state with probably the greatest junior college development, the "open door" concept has long been established: The Education Code of the state (1965) states:

> The principal of any two-year junior college shall admit to the junior college any high school graduate and any other person over 18 years of age who in his judgment is capable of profiting from the instruction offered. [Sec. 10602].

If a two-year college is to operate effectively as a democratizing force within the spectrum of higher education, a relatively unrestrictive admission policy is a prerequisite. Although there have been some subtle changes in the admission policy of the target college as a four-year institution, the overt policy is still generally liberal and allows for the enrollment of students with a wide range of talents, abilities, and preparations. No important differences are apparent between the requirements listed in the 1961-62 college bulletin and those in the 1965-66 bulletin. Generally, all high school graduates are eligible for admission to the target college. Non-high school graduates over 18 years of age and under 21 must pass the General Educational Development Test with a score specified by the college; those over 21 may be admitted by committee action but must make up deficiencies before credit is given toward a degree.

The absence of a statement in the 1965-66 bulletin about special admission privileges for students in the Technical Education Division gave rise to some speculation that the division might have become somewhat more restrictive. The dropped statement reappeared, however, in the 1966-67 bulletin. Faculty in this division also indicated that they had no feeling that there was a more selective admissions screening in effect, although they were aware of getting better prepared students in the four-year programs and perhaps also in the sub-baccalaureate programs. This view was substantiated by records which showed that more A and B level students entered the four-year college than had entered the two-year college.

Official attitudes toward high school grade point average did constitute a distinction between the admission policies of the target college as a two-year and four-year institution. While formerly students with low achievement records had been routinely accepted and then counseled to take appropriate courses, currently admission is not guaranteed to anyone whose high school grade point average is below 2.0 or whose predicted college grade point average is below 1.9. When such applicants are admitted, they are placed immediately on academic warning. Although no records were available, the registrar of the target college estimated that approximately five percent of entering students would fall into this category.

After extension, the target college instituted the use of the American College Tests (ACT) for entering students, primarily for placement purposes. These had been given when the school was a junior college, although it is common practice for two-year colleges throughout the country to administer tests for selective placement purposes. Medsker (1960) reported that of a sample of 222 two-year institutions of all types, all but ten reported using some type of scholastic aptitude tests. Most widely used, he reported, was the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, commonly called ACE.

Both the target and comparison colleges currently use the ACT, but it was not possible to compare their test results with those of junior colleges. And neither college had used the ACT long enough as a four-year college to make it possible to gauge possible differences in academic aptitude of entering students.

Queried on whether the target college should continue its present, generally "open" admission policy, the faculty responded in the following way:

| | | Yes | Percent | No | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Older faculty | (N=40) | 35 | 87.5 | 5 | 12.5 |
| Newer faculty | (N=76) | 44 | 57.9 | 32 | 42.1 |
| Total | (N=116) | 79 | 68.1 | 37 | 31.9 |

While the majority of respondents favored retaining the present admission policy, almost one-third were opposed. The most interesting difference here was between the percentages of older and newer faculty who were not satisfied with the present admission policy (approximately 12 percent of the former and 42 percent of the latter). This divergence of opinion about what is essentially a standard two-year college approach to admission requirements is a major point of difference between old and new faculty and raises real questions about whether a liberal admission policy will be retained. Of the 27 recommendations listed on the reverse side of the questionnaire, the most favorable to the present policy were two which called for enforcement of present policies and several which proposed raising requirements only for certain departments, as for example:

> For the baccalaureate degree we should have a higher admissions standard and for the technical area we should have no admission requirement at all.

The great majority of recommendations, over 20, called for a general increase in admission requirements "across the board." The following is typical of comments favoring greater selectivity of students:

> I feel they [the administration] should be much more selective and require students to perform or else quit school. Their policies seem to be too lenient.

While the majority of the newer faculty were in favor of a liberal policy, an appreciable percentage did express dissatisfaction with it. This may be a cause for concern, since the faculty of the four-year college will increasingly be composed of instructors with backgrounds similar to those of the newer faculty, and it may be that the traditionally "open" junior college admission policy may find itself under increasing pressure for more selectivity.

The admission policy of the comparison college paralleled that of the target college. As a two-year college, the comparison college had admitted all residents of its home county who were high school graduates, all residents of the state who had graduated in the upper two-thirds of their high school classes, and non-high school graduates of the state (at the discretion of the school on the basis of General Educational Development Test scores). Out-of-state students were required to be in the upper half of their high school classes.

The two-year college admission policy was retained with minor exceptions. Admission is now granted all state residents who are high school graduates, but those who ranked in the lowest third of their high school graduating classes are admitted only to the two-year programs, although they may transfer to a baccalaureate program if they attain a C or 2.0 grade point average for their first two years.

In interviews, faculty members at the comparison college expressed at least as much dissatisfaction with the present admission policy as had been expressed at the target college. With few exceptions, the faculty interviewed felt that some measure of greater selectivity would be necessary in the near future.

Faculty in the vocational areas were less inclined to take this position, although even among vocational/technical faculty there were several who expressed doubt about the wisdom of continuing the present relatively "open" admission policy.

Ten of the 15 responding trustees of both colleges also were opposed to a tightened admission policy, but almost half of these trustees from the target college were in favor of increased tuition and fees. No specific recommendations for increased selectivity were made by trustees from either college, however, although four of the nine trustees from the target college and one of the six from the comparison college had favored more selectivity in admissions.

**In summary:** Some increments towards tighter admission policies were noted at each college. The target college no longer assured entry to its native high school graduates whose grade point average fell below 2.0 or whose predicted college grade point average fell below 1.9. The comparison college restricted the lower one-third of high school graduates to probationary entry into the two-year programs.

Questionnaires and interviews revealed that from one-third to one-half of the faculties favored a more restrictive admission policy, indicating a source of considerable pressure. In addition, the student body of the four-year target college is currently of a higher level of academic ability as a result of the enrollment of A and B students who formerly would have left the area to attend a four-year institution.

## Retention, Probation, and Dismissal Policies

Since a significant number of students enter the junior college with inadequate preparation, low motivation, and/or lack of commitment to a specific program or goal, it is necessary for the two-year college to allow maximum opportunities for students to overcome these difficulties. While practices differ from state to state and even from college to college, it is generally agreed that junior college students require more liberal retention, probation, and dismissal policies than those in four-year colleges and universities. The necessity for formulating such policies and maintaining standards at the same time has been of continuing concern to the junior college. This problem was defined by Tillery (1956):

> At their best the junior colleges have struggled to maintain the open door of opportunity while at the same time to preserve the standards of specific programs and courses–and of its certificates and degrees.

> Some colleges have faltered, perhaps, in this difficult job by confusing junior college standards with those of the senior institutions. It is likely, however, that the general concern for standards and the temperate use of probation and dismissal systems will, in the long run, give substance to the open door concept [p. 38].

The crux of the problem–how to maintain scholastic standards, yet insure opportunities for a wide range of talents and abilities–has been approached in different ways. California, for example, under the provisions of the *Administrative Code* (Section 131e) requires junior colleges to set standards of scholarship both for retention and for graduation. These standards may not fall below the minimum set by the Code, which requires that any student failing to attain a 1.5 grade point average be placed on probation. Table 6 shows the 1962-63 practices in California as summarized by the Bureau of Junior College Education.

TABLE 6. PROBATION STANDARDS OF CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1962-63.

| Number of Colleges | Percent | GPA for probation |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2.7 | 1.49 |
| 26 | 36.0 | 1.5 |
| 4 | 5.5 | 1.6 |
| 9 | 12.0 | 1.75 |
| 25 | 35.0 | 2.0 |
| 1 | 1.3 | 2 x total units minus 10 or less |
| 4 | 5.5 | 2 x total units minus 10 or less |

The largest single category of junior colleges followed the minimum standards, while the majority (56.2 percent ) required less than a 2.0 grade point minimum, the customary standard of four-year colleges and universities.

The grade point average of C or 2.0 had been required for graduation in the target junior college and was maintained by the four-year college. The retention, probation, and dismissal policies of the four-year college, however, were more stringent than they had been when the school had been a junior college. In the junior college, first-quarter freshmen were expected to have no less than a 1.5 GPA, second-quarter freshmen no less than a 1.5 GPA, third-quarter freshmen no less than a 1.75 GPA, and sophomores no less than a cumulative GPA of 1.8. Students earning less than these minimums were placed on "academic warning." A student on academic warning who fell below a 1.0 in that quarter was then placed on academic probation. If, during the quarter in which he was on probation, he again fell below a 1.0, he was suspended from the college, although most students could apply for readmission after two quarters to a year.

The retention policy of the present four-year college is somewhat more complicated. A student's probation category is determined by the number of grade points below a 2.0.

> If a student has earned 15 credit hours–10 hours of C and 5 hours of D, he will receive 20 grade points for his 10 hours of C and 5 grade points for his 5 hours of D. This will give him a total of 25 grade points which is 5 points below the 30 necessary for him to earn a 2.0 average.

According to this system, if a student falls 1 to 10 grade points below 2.0, he is placed on "academic warning"; more than 10 grade points below 2.0 he is placed on "academic probation"; and more than 20 points below 2.0 he is placed on "final probation." If he does not earn a 2.0 during the semester on final probation, he is suspended for a year, after which time he may be permitted to re-enroll.

In both the junior college and the four-year college, students on various types of probation were required to carry a reduced load and consult with qualified staff members about their work. Under the retention policy of the junior college, however, a student was, in effect, guaranteed four quarters of attendance even if he was on some form of probation throughout this time. Under the present policy, a student 20 points behind in the first or second quarter, and thus on final probation, would be suspended if he failed to make a 2.0 GPA during this quarter. Theoretically, then, a student under the present system could be suspended after two or three quarters, whereas under the junior college policies he could attend four quarters with a lower grade point average.

No dismissal figures were available for the period during which the target college was a junior college, but interviews with counselors and administrators indicated that not more than a half dozen students were suspended or dismissed in the five years before upward extension took place; most older faculty interviewed could not remember a single case of academic dismissal. In the year 1965-66, however, 216 students were suspended on academic grounds, clearly a reflection of a major shift in the direction of tighter retention, probation, and dismissal standards.

Seventy-four percent of the present faculty who responded to the questionnaire were in favor of the present policy, which is somewhat more selective than the policy of the two-year college had been. Of the newer faculty, over one-third expressed either dissatisfaction with or reservations about such a policy. Of the nine recommendations made, four were to the point that present policies were not enforced strongly enough. A typical statement was: "Probably tighten its [the college's] requirements and eliminate more 'culls'." The other five were in favor of shorter probationary periods.

In interviews at the target college, the faculty expressed considerable feeling in favor of enforcing present policies more strictly and also some feeling that one semester on probation was sufficient for any student. Several faculty members felt that further "tightening up" might alienate members of the community, but neither the additional comments on the questionnaire nor the interviews revealed any support for more liberal policies.

The retention, probation, and dismissal policies of the comparison college were considerably less structured than those of the target college. As both a two-year and a four-year institution the comparison college required a particular grade point average which depended upon the number of units carried, but which had to be at least a 2.0 (C average) by the end of the sophomore year. Students in the two-year college were guaranteed at least one quarter on probation before dismissal, and any progress made toward the minimum grade point average was taken into consideration.

> Students who, after one quarter on probation, are still below the prescribed level of achievement may be granted continued probation when it appears they have tried diligently to improve their standing and have made progress in that direction.

Although progress toward meeting minimum standards was given informal consideration by the four-year comparison college, there was no longer a stated commitment guaranteeing at least one quarter on probation.

> In enforcing the provisions herein relative to probation and suspension, consideration is given to improvement shown as well as to the overall attainment of the student. Students who fail to meet the minimum standards specified below are subject to such action as is considered appropriate.

Data in Table 7 show the effect of the tightening of probation, retention, and dismissal policies at the comparison college.

TABLE 7. COMPARISON COLLEGE: ACTIONS TAKEN RELATIVE TO ACADEMIC DEFICIENCY, 1962 AND 1966.

| | Students on probation | | Students suspended | | Total student actions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 1962 | 202 | 1.4 | 52 | .4 | 259 | 1.4 |
| 1966 | 622 | 12.8 | 246 | 5.1 | 868 | 17.8 |

The percentages of students placed on probation and those suspended increased over 300 percent from the last year of two-year operation to the third year of four-year operation. The fact that students were no longer guaranteed at least one quarter's probation to make up deficiencies was reflected in the 120 first-quarter suspensions made in 1966.

Interviews with faculty at the comparison college tended to indicate the same attitude revealed by the questionnaire at the target college. About one-half of those interviewed felt that probation, retention, and dismissal policies should be strengthened, with the newer faculty more favorable to more stringent policies than the older faculty. At this college also, some faculty felt that public relations with the community might suffer if more restrictive policies were introduced.

The combined trustees of the two colleges were even more inclined than the faculty of the target college to strengthen retention, probation, and dismissal policies. While this may be partially due to differences in the wording of the questionnaire items regarding this function, the trustees' attitudes at both colleges must be considered a factor in any future tightening of policies.

**In summary:** The target college has become more selective in its retention policy, in terms both of grade point average required for continuation and length of probation permitted. Figures indicate that substantially more students were suspended by the four-year college than by the college during its two-year operation. In addition, of faculty responding to the questionnaire, one-quarter of the total and over one-third of the new faculty favored the strengthening of retention, probation, and dismissal policies. One-half of the target college trustees responding to the questionnaire favored strengthening the policies as did four of the five trustees from the comparison college who responded.

The comparison college no longer guarantees at least one-quarter as a probationary period to students who fall below the minimum requirements, and the percentage of students placed on probation or suspended increased over 300 percent in the three-year period following upward extension, including 120 students suspended after one quarter.

# IV

# *Some Conclusions*

## Rationale for Upward Extension

It seems reasonably clear that the immediate reasons for upward extension at both colleges studied were related to rapidly growing populations, increasing demands for additional four-year college opportunities, and the educational needs of young people who, for financial reasons, needed four-year college facilities within commuting distance. Important but nominally secondary considerations for upward extension involved the status and prestige needs of both the community and the college, the need for advanced training in such fields as technology and teaching, and political pressure. In both instances there was also a demonstrated need for four-year college facilities within the areas served by the two colleges.

Somewhat more tangentially, upward extension may have resulted from the inability of junior colleges to institutionalize themselves in certain regions and/or within certain societal or educational structures. The relatively long periods of agitation for the expansion at both colleges indicates that neither one had been able to achieve a unique identity and role which they could institutionalize in the sense referred to by Clark (1960) and Selznick (1957). It seems highly unlikely, however, that either college could have accomplished this unless adequate provisions had been made to provide the necessary four-year college facilities within their respective geographical regions. However, although making such provisions would have alleviated the pressures somewhat for converting the colleges into four-year institutions, it probably would have caused great resentment on the part of the two-year college faculties.

Once a movement for upward extension begins, it evidently becomes self-accelerating unless the conditions under which it arose are altered. In the colleges studied, the movement began shortly after World War II and continued to grow largely because no alternatives were offered to accommodate the need for a four-year college in either locale. This leads to what is here considered the underlying reason for upward extension in the two colleges investigated: At the time that both colleges received authorization to extend, no long-range plan to provide for higher education existed in either state. The lack of such plans continues to be a major concern in the state of the target college, where officials of the state university have asked for a moratorium on further proliferation of institutions of higher learning until a state master plan has been formulated and put into effect. And although the comparison college had belonged to a voluntary system of statewide coordination of higher education, such associations, as Glenny (1965) has noted, are generally more effective in budget preparation and devising legislative appropriations than in long-range planning. With respect to planning, he wrote "... the councils appear not to meet long-run expectations of the state government or the public."

It seems clear that when no long-range overall planning and coordination of educational facilities has been established within a state, or where no statewide machinery for implementing such procedures is provided, local areas tend to take the initiative in promoting four-year colleges when the need becomes great enough, and consider an established two-year college as the logical basis for a four-year college. The temptation to extend an existing college is heightened by two major factors: Expanding existing facilities seems more economical than constructing new ones, and the two-year college staff generally has a vested interest in promoting upward extension in its college.

In regard to the latter factor, it was apparent that the majority of the staffs in both colleges had been opposed to the establishment of a new, separate four-year state college and had assiduously promoted the upward extension of their own two-year colleges. In both colleges, it was assumed that all members of the existing faculties would be retained for the four-year colleges, and opportunities were provided for them to upgrade their professional qualifications.

On the evidence of this study, then, it seems clear that when the need for a four-year college in a given area is clearly demonstrable, and the state lacks a master plan to provide such facilities, the local pressures exerted to extend academic programs in a two-year college may become overwhelming. The impetus for the changeover at both colleges originated at the local and not the state level, with considerable opposition from other areas and other institutions within both states.

It also seems clear that when statewide planning fails to provide four-year college facilities in a given area of proven need, the two-year college will encounter irreconcilable problems in institutionalizing itself as a two-year college. In both instances discussed here, the needs for four-year facilities were so great that they were permitted to take precedence over the functions and integrity of the two-year institutions.

### Impact of the Changeover on Two-Year Functions

Within a broader context, this study was designed to explore goal-serving in complex organizations. The two colleges involved in the study were considered examples of complex organizations and it was demonstrated that in specific areas, as well as in philosophical commitment, the goals of a two-year college differ from those of a four-year college. The colleges had made a commitment to serve both the functions and goals of the two-year college in addition to serving those of the four-year college after upward extension took place. The problem to be considered, therefore, was whether a complex organization could serve two sets of divergent, but not mutually exclusive, goals equitably and concomitantly.

It was hypothesized that one of several situations would emerge: both sets of goals would be served; the newer goals would not be able to gain acceptance; the older goals would be dropped; or one of the sets of goals would gain ascendency to the detriment of the other.

Of the ten variables that were studied, both internal and external to the colleges, the one about which most concern was expressed was the continuance of generally accepted two-year college functions, particularly the one-year and two-year vocational/technical programs. Both of the legislative acts which authorized upward extension for the two colleges had made specific reference to the continuation of such programs, but neither had stated that the colleges were required to continue programs, either academic or occupational, below the baccalaureate level.

While the commitment on the part of the administration and governing boards of both colleges to serve two-year college functions generally seemed clear, there was some expressed reluctance on the part of faculty in both colleges to support all of the functions. Well over 40 percent who responded to the questionnaire were opposed to the continuance of remedial courses and to the awarding of the Associate of Arts degree. Newer faculty in general were less supportive of two-year college functions, and interviews indicated somewhat less support than questionnaire responses. It may have been that faculty members were more inclined to voice opposition than to put them in writing. Substantial segments of the faculty on both campuses were clearly unsympathetic toward certain two-year college functions, and those who were nominally supportive had reservations which, if acted on, would alter the character of such functions. Further, the faculty questionnaire results indicated that newer faculty members are less supportive of two-year college functions than older faculty. This is a significant finding in light of the fact that the faculties of both colleges can be expected increasingly to be composed of teachers without junior college or public school experience, and therefore with neither the training nor experience to predispose them to support traditional junior college functions.

Despite the comparative lack of support by some faculty groups for certain two-year college functions, in both colleges the majority of those within the three personnel groups, i.e., board members, administration, and faculty, favored continuing such functions. However, while it was evident that one-year and two-year vocational/technical curricula were being continued and even slightly increased in number in both colleges, the percentages of the total student bodies majoring in such courses declined. At the target college, this decline was quite dramatic since it was reflected in 12 terminal/vocational programs for which comparison figures were available during a period when the total college enrollment more than doubled. The number of students enrolled in four-year vocational/technical programs was not great enough to account for the decline in two-year programs either numerically or proportionately. It would thus seem that while the target college has attracted greater numbers of students who might previously have gone to other four-year colleges, it is attracting fewer students seeking two-year terminal occupational programs. Despite the commitment of board, administration, and faculty to the continuation of two-year occupational programs, and the small increase in the number of such curricula offered, doubts may be entertained about whether the target college has been able to continue serving this function as well in its four-year operation as it did in its two-year operation.

A similar situation was found in the comparison college. Enrollments by declared majors in 14 terminal two-year occupational programs for which comparisons were available did not keep pace proportionately with total college enrollments even though numerically there was a substantial increase. Thus, despite the best efforts and strong commitment of the two colleges, especially on the part of the administrative staffs, neither college has been able to realize a proportionate development for its respective two-year vocational/technical programs. It might be argued that growth did not take place because the colleges were already meeting this need, but this would not account for the decline in enrollment at the target college. A number of factors may account for this situation, such as:

the substantial increases in tuition and fees at both colleges;

the slightly more restrictive admission requirements;

higher grading standards;

tighter probation, retention, and dismissal policies;

the self-image of the college.

In regard to this last point, it seems important to note that even in a two-year college, terminal students are often keenly affected by lack of status in relation to their peers in the more prestigious transfer programs. McConnell (1962) noted this aspect:

> But in most comprehensive community colleges, the so-called 'terminal' programs seem to wage a difficult and often a losing battle for status in competition with transfer curricula, which carry the prestige of corresponding to 'real' college courses and of preparing students to go on 'to college' in four-year institutions [page 61].

It can only be speculated how much more this lack of status is felt by two-year terminal students on a four-year college campus.

The elimination of interdisciplinary courses specifically designed to provide for the general education needs of students at the target college must also be viewed as a further diminution of junior college functions. While the target college now meets its commitment to general education through regular departmental offerings, as do the majority of two-year colleges, it is generally agreed that such courses leave something to be desired in providing for the general education needs of junior college students and, indeed, perhaps for those of four-year college students also. Most significant, however, is that such courses, deemed necessary by the target college in its two-year operation, were dropped during the period of change to a four-year college. The comparison college also dropped some interdisciplinary courses during its changeover.

Thus, while apparent commitment to two-year college functions remains strong at the target college, the significant area of vocational/technical education at the one-year to two-year level has not only failed to keep pace with college growth in terms of enrollments, but has declined in declared majors at the same time that the general education courses of an interdisciplinary nature have been eliminated. At the comparison college also, enrollments have not increased proportionately with the overall college enrollment and some remedial courses were dropped during the changeover.

Although these curricular departures from serving junior college functions are not insignificant, perhaps even more important are those changes within the two colleges which tend to make for a more selective student body both in economic background and ability. Although neither college operated under the ideal two-year college policy of free tuition, the target college increased its resident tuition and fee costs over 70 percent in the three years immediately following upward extension, and the comparison college increased its costs to students over 300 percent. With respect to tuition and fees, both colleges are now above the average for state colleges in their geographical area and overwhelmingly above average for two-year colleges. This dramatic rise in costs to students raises serious doubts about whether either college will be able to continue to serve the same type of student in the four-year college as it did before. The critical corollary question is whether they will therefore continue to perform the junior college function of being a democratizing agent within higher education. A majority of both older and newer faculty and board members at the target college felt that tuition and fees should be raised even more, and in the year following this study such costs were indeed raised again. Tuition and fee costs constitute serious barriers for the potential junior college student who, more often than not, comes from the lower socioeconomic strata. Any increment seems bound to affect the chances of such young people for entering college, either in a two-year or four-year program.

In addition to becoming more economically selective in their student body makeup, both colleges have established somewhat more selective admission requirements, and these too operate to restrict the entrance of potential students of lower educational attainment. If both colleges were to continue performing junior college functions, it would seem necessary to continue the essentially "open door" policies practiced in their two-year operation. This has not been completely realized and may to some extent account for the elimination of remedial courses at the comparison college.

The more restrictive probation, retention, and dismissal standards also operate to result in a more selective student body. In both colleges the numbers of students either suspended or on probation have risen sharply, and it is important to note that this has taken place during the period when admission policies were also somewhat tightened. Further, it seems evident that grading "standards" have been raised. In both colleges the grade point averages of the freshmen and sophomore classes dropped after the changeover. Many of the old and new faculty at both colleges indicated in interviews that higher grading standards were necessary if they were to maintain academic respectability as a four-year college.

On balance, however, both colleges continue to perform two-year curricular functions by providing adult education courses, short-term vocational/technical programs to meet current business and industrial needs, and community service programs that contribute significantly to the cultural and recreational enrichment of their respective communities. It seems evident that both colleges have been able to increase their educational, cultural, and recreational contribution to the areas they serve, not only quantitatively but qualitatively. It is also clear that there is a strong commitment to these programs on the part of the board, administration, and faculty. The fact that both colleges, after extending, have been able to serve some functions better than others relates specifically to the theoretical base of this study.

A theoretical construct was developed to shed light on whether two sets of goals would be served equitably and concomitantly in a complex organization. In the organizations under the study, the newer goals of a four-year college were added to those of a two-year college with full commitment on the part of the organization to serve both. On the basis of earlier research, which indicated that functions supporting the goals of a two-year college tend to be displaced in a four-year college environment, the following hypothesis was developed:

**The goals of a two-year community college will not be adequately served in a four-year college, even when there is a formal commitment on the part of the four-year college to serve such goals.**

It seems evident that there are several junctures at which the goals of the two different types of colleges conflict, and when this happens, the goals of the two-year college evidently tend to give way to those of the four-year college. Also, when the functions of the two-year college are compatible with or similar to those of the four-year college, they tend to be served better than those functions of the two-year college that are juxtaposed to or are in conflict with those of the four-year college.

Several examples of the former tendency may be drawn from this study. In order to perform functions that serve the goals of the two-year community college, an "open door" policy with respect to admissions is generally considered a prerequisite, while a four-year college is necessarily concerned with admitting only students with a fair chance of completing a baccalaureate program. At both colleges in this study, admission requirements were slightly raised after upward extension took place, although they had remained constant and essentially reflected an "open door" policy during the many years both colleges had operated as two-year institutions.

In order to serve two-year functions, it is generally considered necessary to give students in two-year colleges sufficient time to overcome earlier educational deficiencies or motivational handicaps before either placing them on probation or suspending them. In both colleges the grade point averages required for students to avoid probation were raised, however, and the probationary period before suspension considerably shortened. One of the colleges also eliminated remedial courses. Such policies, quite in keeping perhaps with the goals of a four-year college, are almost diametrically opposed to the developmental and salvage functions of the two-year college. Further, although both colleges added one-year and two-year vocational/technical curricula, there was an actual numerical decrease in declared majors in these areas in one school and both showed a proportionate drop in such course enrollments in relation to the overall growth in enrollments. While this finding cannot be attributed to policy, it was certainly a result of upward extension.

Adult education and community service programs have remained strong, probably because it is natural to consider them legitimate functions of a four-year as well as a two-year college. However, while most four-year colleges perform these functions, few are involved in developmental, remedial, or vocational/technical education below the baccalaureate level.

Although both colleges continue to operate short term vocational/technical and apprenticeship programs, courses are generally given off-campus by part-time, nontenured, nonranked faculty, a practice that produces minimal identification with the college.

It is evident from this study, at least to the present, that in the two schools studied, goals and functions of the four-year college have become dominant over those of the junior college. A more positive conclusion must await a further lapse of time so that the present course of development can be more clearly perceived. A follow-up study after the next three-year period, including both the areas covered in the present study and also comparative information on student body makeup would contribute valuable data to the developmental history of the junior college.

# *Appendices*

## A. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ALL PERSONS HOLDING ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

1. Have you been an administrator in: (Please check)
    1. Elementary school No. of years
    2. Secondary school No. of years
    3. Other junior college No. of years
    4. Other college or university No. of years
2. Have you taught in: (Please check)
    1. Elementary school No. of years
    2. Secondary school No. of years
    3. Other junior college No. of years
    4. Other college or university No. of years
3. Should the college continue its present admission policy?

    Yes No . If no, list recommendations on reverse side.
4. Should the college continue its present academic retention, probation, and dismissal policies?

    Yes No . If no, list recommendations on reverse side.
5. Should tuition and fee charges be:

    Raised How much
    Lowered How much
    Remain the same

6. Should the college offer remedial courses for students whose educational background indicates they currently have little chance for success in college?

   Yes No

7. Should the college continue to award the A.A. and A.S. degrees?

   Yes No

8. Should the college offer compensatory educational programs for the "culturally disadvantaged" if the need for such programs were to be demonstrated?

   Yes No

9. Should the college continue to offer evening and/or adult noncredit courses for the general public?

   Yes No

10. Should the college offer community service programs such as concert and lecture series designed for the general public?

    Yes No

11. Should the college cooperate with outside agencies in offering special vocational/technical programs designed to meet immediate occupational needs?

    Yes No

12. Should the college continue to offer vocational curricula below the baccalaureate level?

    Yes No

13. Should the present counseling and guidance services be:

    Expanded
    Reduced
    Remain the same

## B. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRUSTEES

1. Should the college become more selective in its admission policy?
   Yes No . If yes, please list your recommendations on reverse side.

2. Should the college strengthen its present academic retention, probation, and dismissal policies for students? Yes No . If yes, please list your recommendations on reverse side.

3. Should tuition and fee charges be:
   Raised How much
   Lowered How much
   Remain the same

4. Should the college offer remedial courses for students whose educational background indicates they currently have little chance for success in college? Yes No

5. Should the college continue to award the A.A. and A.S. degrees?
   Yes No

6. Should the college offer compensatory educational programs for the "culturally disadvantaged" if the need for such programs were to be demonstrated? Yes No

7. Should the college continue to offer evening and/or adult noncredit courses for the general public? Yes No

8. Should the college offer community service programs such as concert and lecture series designed for the general public? Yes No

9. Should the college cooperate with outside agencies in offering special vocational/technical programs designed to meet immediate occupational needs? Yes No

10. Should the college continue to offer vocational curricula below the baccalaureate level? Yes No . If yes, should such vocational curricula include general education courses? Yes No

11. Should the present counseling and guidance services be:
Expanded
Reduced
Remain the same

12. Do you feel the college has been able to maintain its older two-year functions? Yes No . If yes, do you feel it will be able to continue these functions? Yes No . If no, what functions have not been maintained and why?

13. Have you detected any pressures to discontinue any of the functions listed in questions 1 through 11? Yes No . If yes, which ones and from where have the pressures come?

14. In your opinion, what were the major reasons for this college to change from a two-year to four-year operation?

15. Would you please list any groups, institutions or agencies, etc., of which you are aware, which opposed the change to a four-year college?

16. Do you feel the college will offer graduate programs within the next five years? Yes No

17. Are you in favor of instituting such programs within the near future?

# *References*

Blau, P. M., & Scott, R. W. *Formal organizations.* San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Bogue, J. P. *The community college.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Brick, M. *Forum and focus for the junior college movement.* New York: Bureau of Publications, 1964.

Buck, P. H. The college teacher and faculty organization. In B. B. Cronkite (Ed.), *A handbook for college teachers.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

California State Department of Education. *A study of the need for additional centers of public higher education in California.* Sacramento: Author, 1957.

California State Department of Education. *A master plan for higher education in California.* Sacramento: Author, 1960.

Clark, B. R. *The open door college.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Corson, J. J. *Governance of colleges and universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

D'Amico, L. A., & Raines, M. R. Employment characteristics of Flint Junior College students. *Junior College Journal,* December 1957, 28, 247-250.

Diekhoff, J. S. *The domain of the faculty.* New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

Eells, W. C., & Martorana, S. V. Curricular changes in 2-year colleges that become 4-year colleges. *Higher Education,* April 1957, 13, 149-153.

Eells, W. C. Do junior colleges become four-year colleges? *Higher Education*, September 1956, 13, 111.

Etzioni, A. *Complex organizations: A sociological reader.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Fariss, G. H. Report of committee on legislation. *Junior College Journal*, May 1947, 17, 385-387.

Gerard, R. W. Problems in the institutionalization of higher education: An analysis based on historical materials. *Behavioral Science*, 1957, 2, 134-146.

Glenny, L. A. State systems and plans for higher education. In L. Wilson (Ed.), *Emerging patterns in American higher education.* Washington, D. C.: The American Council on Education, 1965.

Gouldner, A. W. Theoretical requirements of the applied social sciences. *American Sociological Review*, February 1957, 22(1), 92-102.

Havighurst, R. J., & Neugarten, B. L. *Society and education.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Allyn and Bacon, 1957.

Horn, F. H. Future of the junior college. *Educational Forum*, May 1953, 17, 427-435.

Koos, L. V. How to democratize the junior college. *School Review*, May 1944, 52, 271-284.

Lipset, S. M., Trow, M., & Coleman, J. *Union democracy.* New York: Doubleday, 1956.

McConnell, T. R. *A general pattern for American public higher education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McGrath, E. J. Does the community college have a future? *The Educational Forum*, November 1962, 27, 5-13.

Medsker, L. L. Changes in junior colleges and technical institutes. In L. Wilson (Ed.), *Emerging patterns in American higher education.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Medsker, L. L. *The junior college: Progress and prospect.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Merrill, H. T. Criteria for the development of a private two-year college into a private four-year liberal arts college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1961.

Messinger, S. L. Organizational transformation: A case study of a declining social movement. *American Sociological Review,* 1955, 20, 3-10.

Michels, R. *Political parties.* Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1949.

Millett, J. D. *The academic community: An essay on organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Morrison, D. G. So you plan to change your junior college to a four-year institution. *Phi Delta Kappa,* April 1966, 18, 443.

Pence, O. E. *The Y.M.C.A. and social need.* New York: Association Press, 1939.

Riesman, D. *Constraint and variety in American education.* Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1956.

Roueche, J. E., Jr. An analysis of the transition of a junior college into a four-year liberal arts institution: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1964.

Schultz, R., & Stickler, W. H. Vertical extension of academic programs in institutions of higher education. *The Educational Record,* Summer 1965, 46, 238-241.

Semans, H. H., & Holy, T. C. *A study of the need for additional centers of public higher education in California.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1957.

Selznick, P. *TVA and the grass roots.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949.

Selznick. P. *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation.* Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Sills, D. L. *The volunteers.* Chicago: Glencoe Free Press, 1957.

Simon, K. A., & Grant, W. V. *Digest of educational statistics.* Office of Education Bulletin, No. 18. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Smith, R. J. An analysis of the transition from the junior college program to that of a four-year liberal arts institution at Spring Arbor Junior College. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961.

Thornton, J. W., Jr. *The community junior college.* (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Tillery, D. *A consideration of issues affecting California public junior colleges.* A report of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento and San Francisco, April 1965.

Winter, C. G. *History of the junior college movement in California.* Release No. 20, Bureau of Junior College Education, Rev. December 21, 1964.

GPO 976-141